LUCIAN

THEME AND VARIATION IN THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT
W. DEN BOER · W. J. VERDENIUS · R. E. H. WESTENDORP BOERMA
BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT
W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM QUADRAGESIMUM PRIMUM

GRAHAM ANDERSON

LUCIAN

THEME AND VARIATION
IN THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVI

LUCIAN

THEME AND VARIATION IN THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

BY

GRAHAM ANDERSON

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVI

ISBN 90 04 04735 2

Copyright 1976 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permisson from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

UXORI CARISSIMAE

CONTENTS

Preface ix
Abbreviations xi

I. Theme and Variation: Lucian's Models and Methods . 1
II. Fantastic Description 23
III. Storytelling 41
IV. Characterisation 67
V. Rome 85
VI. Drama I: *Timon* and the Miniatures 90
VII. Drama II: Four Characteristic Situations 103
VIII. Learning and Mock-Learning 113
IX. Arrangement of Themes I: Some Recurrent Patterns . 135
X. Arrangement of Themes II: Typical Problems 150
XI. Conclusion 167

Appendix I: Cross-references and Lucian's Chronology . . . 177
Appendix II: The *Piscator* Scheme: Some Tentative Origins. 182

Select Bibliography 187
Index of Passages of Lucian cited 193
Index of Proper Names 201
Index of Principal Motifs 208

PREFACE

Lucian laughed at scholars who asked too many questions about literature. He would have had grave doubts about the present work. It began as a commentary on Lucian, and it now sets out to show why Lucian is his own best commentator. He varies a small range of material to an exhaustive degree, as few scholars in the past century have failed to realise. But the implications of this store of parallels have still to be fully explored: among ancient authors Lucian offers us one of the most complete collections of internal evidence, and this has yet to be applied systematically to a wide range of scholarly questions. What kind of variation does he tend to practise? Is he likely to borrow from a wide range of recondite sources, when he could be varying one of his most familiar motifs instead? And when he does borrow, how do the motifs already in his repertoire affect his choice of new material? Does his variation-technique stop at themes, or can he use the same facile methods when arranging his work? And finally: is Lucian a hack or a virtuoso —or both?

I have looked at a few simple procedures which Lucian uses in order to make the most of his material, then traced them at work in a number of different fields, from trips to the moon to learned lectures on grammar; and I have applied them as evidence to a number of familiar problems *en route*. Much of this work is necessarily mere marginalia on the monumental explorations of Helm and Bompaire. I have tried to begin where the latter left off, leaving many of the intractable controversies almost untouched, including Lucian's relationship with Menippus or the prosopography of his victims. It is unlikely at this stage that internal evidence will usher in any entirely new answers: but it can alter the balance between two established viewpoints, or help to narrow the range of really probable solutions. The important thing is that it should be taken into account at all. It supports the view that Lucian is a manipulator with fairly limited literary horizons: the aim of this book is not to explain outside those horizons what can be explained within them.

I have reserved two fields for more detailed treatment elsewhere. To avoid any question of circularity I have not discussed any of

the traditional dubia while attempting to build up a picture of Lucian's methods and interests. Each of these works has its own peculiar problems, and I intend to show elsewhere that *de Saltatione*, *Podagra* and *de Parasito* reflect Lucian's response to various kinds of recondite subject-matter. Nor have I dealt in detail with Lucian's excursions into the novel and novella: I have discussed *Philopseudes*, *Toxaris*, *Verae Historiae*, the *Onos*, and *de Dea Syria* in a companion volume under the title *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction*.

My debts are many: to Matthew Macleod and Ewen Bowie, who examined this work as part of an Oxford D. Phil. thesis; to Bryan Reardon and Christopher Robinson, for fruitful conversations on Lucian; to my sometime colleagues John Richmond, Rae Astbury, Ludwig Bieler and Michael Vickers, for unsparing help in fields often far removed from my own; to Robin Nisbet, who first suggested that I should work on Greek *pseudos*, and Roger Mynors, who first harnessed me to Lucian; and most of all to Donald Russell, who supervised my work as a μισαλαζών and μισοψευδής, and to my wife, who helped much and endured more.

Since the Renaissance Holland has found a special place for Lucian. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the co-operation of E. J. Brill in the publication of a difficult work at a difficult time; and the generosity of the Jowett Trustees, whose subvention made publication possible.

University of Kent at Canterbury — Graham Anderson
September 1975

ABBREVIATIONS

The following are referred to by the author's surname or cue-title only:

Bompaire	J. Bompaire, *Lucien écrivain, Imitation et création*, Paris 1958.
Caster, *Pensée*	M. Caster, *Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps*, Paris 1937.
Croiset	M. Croiset, *Essai sur la vie et les oeuvres de Lucien*, Paris 1882.
Hall	J. A. Hall, *Lucian's Satire*, unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge 1967.
Helm, *LM*	R. Helm, *Lukian und Menipp*, Leipzig 1906.
Helm, *PW*	R. Helm, *Lukianos PW* XIII, 1927.
Hirzel	R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog, ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, Leipzig 1895.
Householder	F. W. Householder, *Literary quotation and allusion in Lucian*, Columbia 1941.
Reardon	B. P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.*, Paris 1971.
Schmid-Christ	*Geschichte der griech. Literatur*[6] II. ii, Munich 1924.
Spengel	L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* I-III, Leipzig, Teubner, 1853-56.
Schwartz, *Biographie*	J. Schwartz, *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate*, Brussels 1965.

My *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* are referred to by title only. Abbreviations for Lucian's works are in general those of *LSJ*, with a few modifications for clarity (*Char.*, *Fugit.*, *Katapl.*, *Imag. and Neky.*), and economy (*Hist.* rather than *Hist. Conscr.*); those for periodical literature follow the style of *l'Année Philologique*. My citations are based on the first edition of C. Jacobitz (Leipzig 1836-41), pending the completion of Macleod's *OCT*.

CHAPTER ONE

THEME AND VARIATION: LUCIAN'S MODELS AND METHODS

Lucian is one of the most versatile figures in Imperial Greek literature,[1] as well as the most amusing. His superficial entertainment deals with a wide range of subjects, from the correct usage of rare words to praise of flies and conversations with the gods; and he is equally at home in virulent invective, comic dialogue, conventional wisdom, or fantastic *jeux d'esprit.* It is easy to read celebrated portions of his work in isolation; but to understand the way Lucian works we have to read any of his writings in terms of the rest. It soon becomes clear that his wide range is deceptive: whatever the subject and whatever the genre, we are dealing with ingenious variations on a handful of themes. He does not stop at treating the same theme twice, or rehearsing perfunctory variations on a school simile; all too often he seems to have set himself the task of compressing as much as possible of his repertoire into every work. The result is a literary texture dense with self-pastiche; often its effect is to turn a facile entertainer into a highly elusive one. Lucian will report an event as historical fact, when it recurs in fiction or fantasy throughout his work; he will use the

[1] The standard work on Lucian is J. Bompaire, *Lucien écrivain, Imitation et création,* Paris 1958. B. places Lucian against the background of *paideia* and *mimesis* as cultivated in rhetorical tradition. His work is continued and broadened by B. P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.,* Paris 1971, who sets Lucian in the midstream of Imperial Greek literature, between formal rhetoric and the novel. He provides a valuable bibliographical orientation, pp. 156-161, nn. 4-9 (the work-by-work guides in Hirzel, *Der Dialog* II.269-334 and Schmidt-Christ[6] II.ii.710-744 are also invaluable). Since Bompaire two highly individual works have set out in very different ways to relate Lucian to some of the known personalities and issues of his age. J. Schwartz, *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate,* Brussels 1965, uses these points of contact to construct a chronology which few are able to accept, but with many valuable observations en route; B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian,* Toronto 1973, claims to 'reject' Bompaire's approach by relating Lucian to some of the personalities of the Second Sophistic (as outlined in G. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire,* Oxford 1969). Baldwin does not fulfil his claim, since Bompaire relates Lucian most emphatically to the educational conventions of his age; but he does provide a provocative—if sometimes cursory—discussion of some of the problems involved.

same theme over again when he seems to be imitating two quite different authors; or he will change his standpoint on any subject from one dialogue to another. If an author of this kind mentions men on the moon riding on three-headed vultures,[2] it is not enough to speculate on lost writers about the moon, or search the paradoxographers for three-headed birds. We have to look not only back but across—and notice that Lucian also has a philosophic illustration about how to write on three-headed men;[3] a story about three men who merged into one—through their friendship;[4] or crude literary puns on τρικάρανος and τριφάλης.[5] And he attacks a rival who had proved too resourceful with this same material.[6] All these passages will give us some insight into the kind of writer we are dealing with. If we cannot know which was his first excursion into the world of three-headed creatures, we know at least that he produced several variations on this same motif: it is part of his repertoire and has to be recognised as such.

Lucian's variation technique has not received the attention it deserves. The large crop of dissertations devoted to him at the turn of the century contained no *de Luciano sui imitatore* as such. But self-imitation did play a prominent part in R. Helm's *Lukian und Menipp*:[7] Helm believed that Lucian's most tedious and literal repetitions were the *disiecta membra* of the third-century Cynic Menippus, and proceeded to reconstruct his source accordingly. Half a century later J. Bompaire traced most of this same material to contemporary rhetoric. But Bompaire's *Lucien Écrivain*[8] is still very much a *Lucien Emprunteur*: the author has gone to the opposite extreme from Helm, so that his vast encyclopaedia of rhetorical themes contains only five pages devoted to self-imitation, which Bompaire condemns with the title 'Création Mécanique'.[9] Only incidentally, in a discussion of rhetorical similes,[10] does he concede that some of Lucian's most attractive work could be accounted for in his 'rumination' of favourite material. I have set

---

[2] *VH* I.11.
[3] *Herm.* 74.
[4] *Tox.* 53 cf. 62.
[5] *Fugit.* 32 cf. 31.
[6] *Pseudolog.* 29.
[7] Leipzig, 1906.
[8] See n. 1 *supra.*
[9] 539 ff.
[10] 436 cf. 541.

out to demonstrate that this feature has to be reckoned with before one can do justice to any aspect of the author's work.

Why is variation so important in Lucian? It is tempting to take the reasons for granted and assume that he was simply an incompetent hack running out of material;[11] or we can look for an explanation in his rhetorical training.[12] But this is not the whole answer. Lucian admits his debts to a variety of influences—Dialogue, Comedy and 'Menippus' [13] as well as rhetoric: we should notice what each of them had to offer towards the formation of his technique.[14]

Lucian did indeed have a rhetorical training, and the programme of elementary *progymnasmata* in the schools clearly encouraged pupils to practise variation. By their very nature some of the exercises called for ingenious but stereotyped reworking. Aphthonius demonstrates how to work a γνώμη,[15] and produces six variations in all: he restates the subject, extends it into a *syncrisis*, adds an appropriate simile and illustration, and rounds off with a parallel 'authority'. By working a proof and disproof of the same subject (κατασκευή and ἀνασκευή), he can produce even more rigid results.[16] And at least some masters encouraged their pupils to work the same material several times over: Hermogenes supplies us with two versions of the same μῦθος, one with inserted speeches and the other without;[17] while both Theon and Quintilian encourage frequent paraphrase of the pupil's own stock.[18]

Nor could the fully-fledged rhetor afford to forget these elementary procedures. It is clear from Philostratus' *Vitae Sophistarum* that the second century sophists were professional entertainers competing regularly for the loyalty of audiences who expected

---

[11] Helm e.g. *LM* 16; 321.

[12] Bompaire 539; cf. B. A. van Groningen, *Mnemosyne*, 4th series 18 (1965), 51; B. P. Reardon, *Phoenix* 23 (1969), 308.

[13] *Bis Acc.* 26 ff.

[14] The history of self-imitation in Antiquity has yet to be written: E. Stemplinger, (*Das Plagiat in der griech. Literatur*, Leipzig-Berlin 1912, 185-93; 253-7) treats *Selbstzitate* and *Selbstwiederholungen* as special cases in his study of literary borrowing, but cites only a few examples at random, chiefly from Euripides and Demosthenes; he discusses neither Homer nor Ovid, let alone Lucian.

[15] Spengel II.26 f.

[16] *ibid.* 28-32.

[17] *ibid.* 3 f.

[18] *ibid.* 62; Quint. X.v.9-11; cf. Fronto, *ad M. Caesarem* III.12, p. 44 van den Hout.

constant novelty within a very limited range. The virtuoso rhetor had every temptation to exploit his own successes as resourcefully as he dared; and the fashion for extempore speaking made it still more advisable to have one's personal repertoire at the ready. Lucian could sneer at the professional upstart who draws on his own storehouse of clichés;[19] but no-one did so more persistently than Lucian himself. The eminent sophist Philagrus of Cilicia came to grief when Herodes Atticus' pupils read out the published declamation he was pretending to improvise.[20] Yet the biographer of the sophists is ecstatic over Alexander Peloplaton when he improvises two successive Scythian discourses, changing his rhythms and expressions so that he avoids the impression of repeating himself; and he commends Hippodromos for a similar virtuoso effect.[21] The rhetorical theorist Hermogenes actually devotes a subsection of his περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος to the trick of not seeming to repeat one's own or someone else's material.[22] We do not need to look very far in the surviving declamations to see the precept in practice. Polemo allows both his fictitious pleaders to bring on Pan and the gods at Marathon to support their conflicting arguments;[23] and Aelius Aristides works his variation on the grand scale by writing whole groups of declamations on the same themes, as in the pair of *Theban Discourses* or the five *Leuctrians*,[24] where he pleads twice on each side and once for neutrality from the same set of historical circumstances.

But Lucian poses as a moralist as well as a rhetor—so far as the two were separable. Much of the material so persistently worked by early Imperial writers belongs to the common ground between rhetoric and popular philosophy,[25] and certain moralists' illustrations lent themselves to facile variation. The *halbphilosoph* Maximus of Tyre relies on these to a striking degree;[26] and when a writer decides to tell his audience that all the world's a stage, he is not

[19] *Rh. Pr.* 17.
[20] Philostratus *VS* 579.
[21] *VS* 572; 619.
[22] Spengel II.445.
[23] Pp. 13, 30 Hinck.
[24] 38-39D; 33-37D.
[25] For a useful repertoire of moralists' themes, see A. Oltramare, *Les origines de la diatribe romaine*, Lausanne 1926, 44 ff.
[26] See the apparatus of parallels in Hobein's edition (Teubner 1909); also K. Meiser, *Studien zu Maximos Tyrios, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1909. 6, 13-24.

likely to leave it at that; this resilient cliché [27] decorates Heliodorus' bizarre novel or Marcus Aurelius' private reflections time and time again.[28] It is no surprise when Lucian exploits it more extensively still.

The Greek novelists also use techniques similar to Lucian's: like him they vary not only the inevitable rhetorical clichés but the fantastic framework round about them. They protract the plots in order to present more and more absurd versions of the same incident: Achilles Tatius gives his heroine not one grotesque *Scheintod* but three,[29] and Heliodorus contrives three 'burning brides';[30] Charito's hero works endless variations on his suicide speeches,[31] while Iamblichus's continually masquerades as a corpse or a ghost.[32] In their very different ethos both Longus and Apuleius are equally addicted: there are three abortive invasions of Lesbos in *Daphnis and Chloe*,[33] three variations on a procession in the *Metamorphoses*.[34] Lucian's own manner [35] is particularly close to that of both Longus and Achilles [36]—all three are sophisticated and well-equipped rhetors who seem to overwork the conventions for their own amusement, often to the point of ridicule.[37]

But contemporary literature provides only half the background for Lucian's literary tastes. At least some rhetorical theorists

---

[27] Usefully collected by M. Kokolakis, *The Dramatic Simile of Life*, Athens 1960, 53 ff.

[28] Copious cross-references within Marcus are cited in the commentary by A. S. L. Farquarson, Oxford 1944.

[29] Achilles III.15; V.7; VII.4.

[30] Heliodorus II.1; II.29; VIII.9.

[31] Charito IV.iii.9; VI.ii.11; VII.i.6.

[32] Photius *Cod.* 94. 74b; 75a; 76a.

[33] Longus I.28 ff.; II.12 ff.; II.20 ff.

[34] See Riefstahl, *Der Roman des Apuleius*, Frankfurt 1938, 69 f., and especially 75.

[35] See my *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction*, ch. VI.

[36] For Achilles' humour see D. B. Durham, *CPh* 33 (1938), 1-15; more recent datings of Achilles make it highly unlikely that he set out to parody Heliodorus; but he is clearly smiling at the tradition.

[37] Alciphron and the Philostrati also deserve consideration, but it is difficult—and superfluous—to use them as evidence. I follow Rohde (*Gr. Rom.*[3] 369) and Schmid-Christ[6] II.ii.826 in believing that Alciphron must have borrowed from Lucian and Comedy separately, so that he is no evidence for the formation of Lucian's habits of self-repetition. As to Philostratus, there are several doublets in the fictional works (*VA* III.22, IV.1-13/*Heroicus*; *VA* IV.24/*Nero*); but it is safer not to cite these as examples of self-pastiche when they could conceivably be complimentary citations from one Philostratus to another (*contra* F. Solmsen *TAPhA* 71, 1940, 556-72).

encouraged their pupils to study self-paraphrase as practised by classical writers, and Theon [38] and Hermogenes [39] both recommend Demosthenes for this purpose. Lucian's sources of supply were very different; and all of them are rich in examples of literary variation —without being necessarily 'rhetorical'.

He was an avid imitator of Old Comedy, and we should notice that Aristophanes himself had relied heavily on literary doublets: Dicaeopolis holds off the Acharnians by kidnapping their coal-scuttle; Mnesilochus holds off the women by seizing their wineskin.[40] Among the plays certainly known to Lucian, the 'plots' are a patchwork of the same absurd motifs. At least twice the hero intercepts sacrifices to starve out the gods;[41] makes a bizarre expedition to rescue some popular personality;[42] watches a debate between old and new intellectual fashions;[43] promotes a new economic system;[44] or goes on aerial escapades.[45] Since Lucian absorbed his limited repertoire of plays thoroughly, and even pieced together a 'Comedy' of his own, it is clear that he could have absorbed this feature of the dramatist's technique at the same time.[46] When he knows two celestial journeys in *Aves* and *Pax*, he has to produce a similar doublet in his own work: Menippus goes up to heaven in *Icaromenippus*, while Lucian himself goes to the moon and the Isles of the Blest in *Verae Historiae*.

Lucian has also made constant use of Plato's literary mannerisms; and here again he is drawing at first hand on portions of an author addicted to self-pastiche. Plato repeats stereotyped opening scenes at the palaestra,[47] or similar portraits of the attractive young pupil

---

[38] Spengel II.63.
[39] Ibid. 446.
[40] *Ach.* 325 ff./*Thesm.* 695 ff.
[41] *Av.* 550 ff./*Plut.* 137 ff.
[42] *Pax* 103 ff.; 222 ff. (Peace)/*Ran.* 68 ff. (Euripides).
[43] *Nub.* 889 ff. (the two *Logoi*)/*Ran.* 757 ff. (Aeschylus and Euripides).
[44] *Ach.* 719 ff./*Plut.* 225 ff.
[45] *Av.*/*Pax supra*.
[46] It is more difficult to assess the influence of New Comedy on Lucian's methods. He seems to have been rather less interested in it (see Householder 32 and *infra* 93ff.). Although the themes of *D. Meretr.* are much more restricted, Lucian is in effect producing the same kind of mosaic of themes here as the New Comic dramatists must have done with the constant re-shuffling of love-affairs, mistaken identity, or fortunate discovery of tokens familiar from Roman Comedy.
[47] *Charmides* 153A-158C; *Lysis* 203A-207C.

or the patronising sophist;[48] and he will work out numerous rephrasings of the same similes,[49] or a whole series of rival encomia on love.[50] But above all Lucian shows a knowledge of several Platonic myths,[51] where the author had re-shuffled fantastic motifs in such a way that no two examples contain the same combination. Again Lucian has the chance to absorb techniques and subject-matter at the same time.

There is unfortunately no way of finding out how much he could have absorbed from Menippus' technique. Helm tacitly assumed that he repeated material where Menippus did not, so that all the variation must be Lucian's; but it is just as likely that Menippus himself practised self-pastiche and set Lucian yet another example. Certainly surviving writers who do use 'diatribe' material tend to employ repetition and variation on a large scale: Horace, whose rhetorical tendencies are scarcely conspicuous, still has a taste for doublets on similar subjects—attacks on discontent,[52] variations on 'si quis deus',[53] snatches of prying in high society,[54] or gibes at the Stoics.[55] He too makes the most of his opportunities to combine moralising themes,[56] so that *Sat.* II. vii for example turns out as a pastiche of 'characteristic' Horatian topics.[57] We have already

---

[48] Lysis and Charmides themselves, *ibid.*; Protagoras and Gorgias in their respective dialogues.

[49] E.g. *Symp.* 215A, 216D, 221E/222A, where he rephrases the same basic simile of Silenus three times within a short space. Lucian imitates the whole passage as a compliment to Nigrinus, *Nigr.* 35-38, with equally elaborate variation. For a convenient list of Plato's repeated similes, see R. Louis, *Les métaphores de Platon*, Paris 1945, Appendix, 185 ff.

[50] *Symposium, passim*; *Phaedrus* 230E-257B.

[51] Judgements of souls (*Gorgias* 523A ff., *Phaedo* 113D ff., *R* X.614D, *Phaedrus* 249A); distinctions between the offending souls (*Gorgias* 524E f., *Phaedrus, Phaedo ibid.*); a complex physical structure (*Phaedo* 108E ff., *R* X.616B ff.); a view of the real world from above, (*Phaedo* 109E, *Phaedrus* 247D); transmigration and cycles of existence (*R* X.620A ff., *Phaedrus* 248C ff.); the search for a suitable lover (*Phaedrus* 252D ff., *Symp.* 191 ff.). Lucian uses most of these motifs himself, and reshuffles his own pictures of the after-life in exactly the same way (*Philops.* 22-24; *VH passim*; *Neky.*; *Katapl.*; *D. Mort.*).

[52] *Sat.* I.i/*Ep.* I.i.85 ff.; *Ep.* I.viii.10 ff./*Ep.* I.xi.20 ff.

[53] *Sat.* I.i.15; *Sat.* II.vii.22 ff. For numerous other examples in Horace, see E. T. Silk, *YCS* 19 (1966), 234-51.

[54] *Sat.* I.ix; *Sat.* II.vi.

[55] *Sat.* I.iii.124 ff; *Sat.* I.i.107.

[56] *Sat.* I.ii.57 ff./II.iii.259 ff./II.vii; II.vi.16 ff., II.vi.117/I.vi; *Ep.* I.vi, II. vi/I.vii.

[57] I.i (discontent); I.ii (adultery); I.iii (inconsistency); I.vi (subservience);

noticed the same tendency in contemporary second-century moralists:[58] in Menippus Lucian knew one of their most notable predecessors as well.

The *progymnasmata*, then, were not Lucian's only contact with literary variation: Plato and Aristophanes at least were conspicuous masters of it. Of course their example would overlap to some extent with the lessons of the schools, but it is misleading to say that Lucian simply applies rhetorical techniques when writing variations on his favourite authors: their own sets of variations were there before him, and gave him additional incentive—and all-important 'authority'—to use his resources to the full. With his evident love of virtuosity, he could be relied upon to carry their example to excess.

In spite of these converging traditions much of a writer's variation-technique will depend on his subject-matter and personal inclination. Lucian's habits could have little in common with those of Aelius Aristides, for example: even when the latter constructs two μελέται on the same theme, the resulting variation is little different from that of Lucian's *Phalaris* declamations, which are by no means typical. Theme and argument leave the writer little room for manoeuvre. And Aristides uses even the most prefabricated ornaments only in a perfunctory way:[59] he is restricted by his choice of historical subjects and his desire to mimic the mannerisms of Demosthenes; and since he did not improvise in public,[60] he could afford to avoid the makeshifts forced on others.[61] Dio of Prusa's career and interests have much more in common with

---

II.ii (gluttony). For a discussion of Horace's mosaic of themes, see N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge 1966, 194 ff.

[58] *Supra* 4f.

[59] Cf. A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la Sophistique dans la province d'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ère*, Paris 1923, 417; and cf. Wilamowitz' verdict, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1925, 349 (= Kleine Schriften III.448).

[60] Philostratus *VS* 585.

[61] Plutarch is exceptionally repetitive, but in a different way. He will often develop didactic similes for their own sake—a legacy of his early rhetorical training; but the bulk of his doublets are merely 'blocks' of information transferred from one part of the corpus to another for the reader's convenience (Cf. F. Krauss, *Die rhetorischen Schriften Plutarchs*, Diss. Nürnberg 1912, 69 ff.; C. Brokate, *de aliquot Plutarchi libellis*, Diss. Göttingen 1913, 17 ff.; F. Fuhrmann, *Les images de Plutarque*, Paris 1966). This modest and erudite personality is much less concerned with combining and developing imaginative material for its own sake.

Lucian's, and he can even outstrip the latter in his extravagant parades of similes:[62] but we still find that Lucian will indulge in variation where Dio will not. When Dio sets out to rework a single subject, as in his three discourses on Diogenes,[63] he opts for three completely different approaches, and tries to avoid any trace of self-imitation; when Lucian is dealing with Diogenes, he will rework the same situation indefinitely, and say the same about Menippus or 'Cyniscus' as well.[64]

Part of the distinction lies in Lucian's purpose. No other writer of the period is σπουδαῖος ἐς τὸ γελασθῆναι for more than a fraction of his time. And the more serious an author's purpose, be it the decline of oracles, the politics of Bithynia, or the Cynic way of life, the less scope he has to develop the frivolous themes with which the *progymnasmata* had equipped him. Lucian on the other hand has nothing to do except manipulate themes, in spite of the moral intensity so long credited to him. And virtuoso displays are a mark of the *nimium amator ingenii sui*. It is no accident that the closest one can really find to Lucian's methods *and* subject-matter as a whole is probably Ovid: intensive self-pastiche and ingenious rhetorical treatment of myth go easily together.[65]

How, then, can we expect Lucian to vary his material? Scholars have not found it altogether easy to come to terms with his literary habits. Eduard Schwartz threw out a challenge eighty years ago when he pointed out that the study of Lucian's variations ought to yield more results than ill-starred attempts to settle his chronology.[66] The invitation has not been taken up. Helm began the task of collecting Lucian's repertoire of themes, and based his article in *PW* on a brief account of the cross-references between dialogues;[67] but he had already dismissed Lucian as a worthless hack twenty years before, and this judgement severely limits the value of his

---

[62] Collected by J. Oesch, *Die Vergleiche bei Dio Chrysostomus*, Diss. Zurich, 1916.

[63] Dio *Or.* VI, VIII, IX.

[64] E.g. *Bis Acc.* 24, cf. *Pisc.* 24; *Katapl.* 13, 26 ff., (Cyniscus), cf. *D. Mort.* 6.2, 10.9 (Menippus).

[65] For Ovid's self-imitation see C. Ganzenmueller, *Ph* 70 (1911), 274 ff., 397 ff. His practice is in sharp contrast to Virgil's: in most cases over a line in length the latter allows material from the Georgics only as similes in the Aeneid (see J. Sparrow, *Half-lines and Repetitions in Vergil*, Oxford 1931, 90-111).

[66] *BPhW* 16 (1896), 360.

[67] XIII.2.1725-77.

collection. In effect he assembled little more than the 'Cynic' commonplaces already listed in *Lucian und Menipp*, and added a few repeated tags and proverbs from the works not discussed there. Apart from this the subject has received only casual contributions.[68] Certainly there are several useful catalogues of similar material—Lucian's similes, proverbs, and quotations have all been collected [69] —but these lists also leave many cross-references untouched: a simile has to be classified along with others of its kind; if Lucian repeats the same material as a story or a dramatic sketch, then the simile-hunter can have no use for it. On the whole commentators on Lucian have been equally reticent: 'specialist' commentaries are inevitable in the case of an author with such varied interests, and experts in Syrian religion or ancient magic have not always acquainted themselves with their author's capricious habits. In recent years there has been a welcome improvement,[70] but it is still only a beginning. There have been very few attempts so far to notice Lucian's fondness, not for a particular simile or story or proverb, but for the same *motif* in any shape or form. Often a clumsy label like 'the pretender in elaborate disguise' will cover a wide cross-section of Lucian's work much more usefully than three lists that separate the philosopher compared to a tragic actor,[71] Cantharus as the ass in lion's skin,[72] and Menippus masquerading in Heracles' costume.[73] Each of these can of course be related to a separate source, but when Lucian is liable to treat them interchangeably or conflate them at the first opportunity, they often have to be considered together. I have set out to show that Lucian manipulates his material in a much more flexible manner than Helm has recognised, particularly outside the so-called 'Menippean' pieces.

His methods are few and simple. He never hesitates to repeat a passage almost word for word for its own sake, even when its two

[68] Listed by Bompaire 539.

[69] O. Schmidt, *Metapher und Gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians*, Diss. Zurich, Winterthur 1897; Th. Rein, *Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten bei Lukian*, Diss. Tübingen, 1894; F. W. Householder, *Literary quotation and allusion in Lucian*, Columbia, New York, 1941.

[70] Homeyer on *Historia* (Munich 1965); Beaupère on *Vit. Auct.* (Paris, 1967); Husson on *Navigium* (Paris, 1970). The present study was in progress before the last two appeared.

[71] *Icar.* 29 and *passim.*

[72] *Fugit.* 33.

[73] *Neky.* 1.

contexts are almost identical. He is especially facile when dealing with the raw material of satire: twice over we find Lucian's poor man learning about the rich man's ailments;[74] a tyrant brought to heal at Charon's boat;[75] Zeus reminded about his own tomb in the middle of a debate;[76] or philosophers' crimes reported in heaven.[77] Very often too he will repeat details automatically. We find him relying very heavily in his dialogue technique on routine formulae, tags, and proverbs;[78] and whatever aspect of philosophers he singles out for attack, he can always find room for a tirade against their technical terms as well.[79]

It is just as much a matter of routine to expand or contract any given motif. Lucian may indeed produce a new work simply to develop a particular motif on a different scale: there is scarcely a single scene in *D. Mort.* that does not also appear in a reduced form elsewhere;[80] and most works include at least some hints which recur as the framework of a whole piece.[81] In *de Mercede Conductis* there are routine summaries of no fewer than three of Lucian's other works: the man of letters gives his patron the wrong reply out of sheer embarrassment—the central theme of *pro Lapsu*; or the philosopher is put up for auction or dragged off as a slave, like the victims of *Vitarum Auctio* and *Fugitivi* respectively.[82] And in turn the central theme of *Merc.Cond.* itself—the scholars who are forced

[74] *Gall.* 23/*Sat.* 28.

[75] *Katapl.* 13/*D. Mort.* 10.4.

[76] *J. Trag.* 45/*Deor. Conc.* 6.

[77] *Icar.* 10/*Fugit.* 18 f.

[78] The interlocutor discovers some new facet in his friend's character: *Tox.* 8: ἐλελήθεις δέ με, ὦ γενναῖε, καὶ γραφεὺς ἀγαθὸς ὤν; *Gall.* 28: ἐλελήθεις με, ὦ ἀλεκτρυών, καὶ σὺ γόης ὤν; *pro Imag.* 15: Πολύστρατε, οἷος ὢν ῥήτωρ ἐλελήθεις με; *cf. Neky.* 1: Ἡράκλεις, ἐλελήθει Μένιππος ἡμᾶς ἀποθανών, κᾆτα ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀναβεβίωκεν; The performer welcomes a timely reminder to help him with his tall story: *Neky.* 19, *Philops.* 38 εὖ γε ὑπέμνησας; *D. Meretr.* 13.2 καλῶς ὑπέμνησας. There are copious appeals to friendship in Platonic fashion (*Navig.* 4, cf. 11; *Icar.* 3 ff.; *Neky.* 2; *Philops.* 5; *Nigr.* 6): see Bompaire 312. For Lucian's use of proverbs, *ibid.* and bibliography.

[79] *E.g. Conv.* 23; *Gall.* 11; *Pisc.* 35; *Timon* 54; *Bis Acc.* 11, 21 f.; *Fugit.* 13; Herm. 81.

[80] See Helm *LM* 191 ff.

[81] Among the most obvious are *de Electro* 1/*D. Deor.* 25; *Herm.* 24/*Nigr.*; *Hist.* 29/*VH*; *Pseudolog.* 25/*Iud. Voc.*; *Herm.* 11 f./*Conv.*; *D. Mort.* 10,27/ *Katapl.*; *Bis Acc.* 1-2/*J. Trag.*; *Icar.* 23 f./*J. Conf.*; *D. Mort.* 20.3/*Gall.*; *Sacr.* 8/*Icar.*; *VH* II.31 and *Navig.* 24/Timon; *Bis Acc.* 13/*Somnium*; *J. Trag.* 30/*Alex.*; *Demonax* 12/*Eunuchus*; *J. Trag.* 15 ff., 42/*Deor. Conc.*; *Fugit.* 1/ *Peregr.*; *Herm.* 71/*Navig.*; *Katapl.* 6/*D. Mort.*

[82] *Merc. Cond.* 11; 23; 24.

to toady to a rich boor—reappears as a compressed allusion at *Adv.Ind.*20. It is of course quite clear that Lucian is not developing or enlarging motifs all the time: in *Historia* he inserts a rather colourless version of a story he had already told in a more elaborate way in *pro Imag.*[83] some three years before. *Nescit quod bene cessit relinquere.*

In his catalogue Helm cites copious examples of both these types of borrowing; and it is largely to them that Lucian owes his reputation for tasteless monotony. But beyond this point scholars have tended to lose sight of what he is doing. He will often vary a theme by making minor changes in the details. In the course of their respective travels, Menippus and Lucian attend a symposium in the other world: in *Icaromenippus* Menippus is entertained in heaven with selections from Pindar and Hesiod, and dancing by Silenus; in *Verae Historiae* however Lucian listens in the Isles of the Blest to Homer and lyric selections, with dancing by Diogenes.[84]

Lucian seldom misses an opportunity to ring the changes in this way: when Hermes is conducting an allegorical figure down to earth (Justice, Philosophy, or Wealth), he is sure to land next to some person appropriate to the region (Pan beside the Acropolis, Orpheus in Thrace, or Penia in Attica), who will then find an excuse to withdraw (Pan dislikes the philosophers, Orpheus wants to avoid Cantharus, and Penia keeps her distance from Ploutos).[85] Often Lucian will follow up an important proclamation with a 'swarm scene'—philosophers or dicasts on the Acropolis, flatterers swarming up to Timon's tower, or gods jostling in the assembly.[86] Or he indulges in parallel similes which are too easily allowed to go unnoticed.[87] We have to see the long ornamental comparisons in *Nekyomanteia*, *Icaromenippus* and *Charon* as parallel variations.[88] In each case the spectator has made his fantastic journey and arrived at his vantage-point to review the human condition, with the help of rhetorical illustration. The first two are obviously stage similes: Fortune orders the actors to hand back their costumes, or the choregus sends each of the chorus off the stage. In *Charon*

[83] *Hist.* 12/*pro Imag.* 9.
[84] *Icar.* 27/*VH* II.15, 18.
[85] *Bis Acc.* 9; *Fugit.* 29; *Timon* 1.
[86] *Pisc.* 42; *Bis Acc.* 13; *Timon* 45 f.; *Deor. Conc.*
[87] As does O. Schmidt, *Metapher und Gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians*, Diss. Zurich 1897, 64, 67, 90, 118.
[88] *Neky.* 16, *Icar.* 17, *Charon* 15 f.

however there is no mention of the theatre, but the Fates suspend and entangle each man by a thread which is allowed to break: Lucian has simply substituted a 'puppet on the string' simile for the more usual 'tragic actor'.[89]

Not all his variations are so mechanical. Often he can manipulate the most commonplace material into sharply different contexts, and so invest it with several different nuances. For example, he has a well-stocked repertoire of fantastic flights, and sends off several of his characters to visit the exotic sights familiar from any rhetorician's handbook. But the results in each case are quite different. In *Navig.*44 he uses Timolaus' monologue to illustrate the vanity of human wishes:

> 'No-one else could see a winged gryphon or the Phoenix in India—but *I* could; and I should be the only man to know the sources of the Nile and how much of the earth is inhabited, and whether anyone lives in the Antipodes. What I should enjoy most of all is this: I should be able to announce the victor at the Olympic Games on the same day in Babylon, and after breakfast in Syria say, I should dine in Italy . . . '

It is not difficult to find the two halves of this passage reflected separately elsewhere: but now the marvellous sights turn out to be the chores of the gods:

> *D. Mar.* 15: 'You were lucky, Zephyrus, to see such a lovely sight! All I saw was gryphons, elephants, and black men'.
> *Bis Acc.* 2: 'The biggest nuisance is that I (Zeus) have to be at a sacrifice at Olympia and at the same time watch the battle in Babylon and send hail among the Getae and feast in Ethiopia'.

But these two passages are very different in themselves. In *Bis Accusatus* Lucian has simply turned the same catalogue inside out. But scholars are apt to miss the little touch at *D.Mar.*15: this time Lucian resists the temptation to write a long catalogue, and contents himself with a subtle hint. Notus has just found out that while he was watching the usual tiresome sights in the East, he has been missing the real fun at home (a bridal procession for Zeus and Europa): instead of a tedious travelogue, Lucian has given him the last word in a little snatch of celestial gossip.

He may also choose to insert the same expression in two very

[89] For this image cf. Marcus II.2; III.16; VI.16, 28; VII.3 (puppet and actor), 29; XII.19.

different contexts. In a piece of mythical make-believe Athene wants to know why Aphrodite is asking a leading question about Paris' marriage prospects: Hermes gives a diplomatic reply—it just occurred to her, without any prior design. On his own comic travelogue Lucian discusses Homeric questions with Homer, and asks why the Iliad begins with the Wrath: the answer is the same—it just occurred to him, without any prior design![90]

Often a change of speaker is enough to transform the most commonplace material. Timon makes the conventional complaint that poets tell their lies *metri gratia*—but the same point has quite a different nuance when it comes as a concession from the mouth of Hesiod, who casually implicates his professional colleague Homer for good measure![91] Or Rhetoric appropriately quotes Demosthenes, her best pupil; but Lucian gives similar tags to Zeus—who has to fall back on a mortal orator to supply him with an opening for his speech![92]

Lucian can equally well transform a stock comparison by assigning it to some unlikely spokesman: Helm and Schwartz noticed that he uses almost identical similes about Daedalus at *Imag.*21 and *Gall.*23; but the former example is a conventional digression in a panegyric: Lucian himself is comparing Panthea's humility to Daedalus' low flight. In *Gallus* however the speaker is a cock, demonstrating that animals can be educated sophists as well. In the same vein his master, the humble cobbler Micyllus, becomes infected by this parade of culture, and makes up an elaborate stage-simile; or in *Charon* [93] the ferryman is drawn by Hermes' eloquent comparisons to rival Homer's similes on his own account.[94] The new setting enables Lucian to smile in a subtle way at his own material. When he can do nothing else with rhetorical clichés, he can make them as incongruous as possible.

Often he will manipulate the same motifs in opposite directions. Menippus passes the sun on his right; Lucian passes it on his left.[95] Zeus complains about having to spend all his time on his chores; Timon accuses him of leaving them undone.[96] And Menippus has

[90] *Dear. Iud.* 4/*VH* II.20.
[91] *Tim.* 11/*Hes.* 5.
[92] *Bis Acc.* 27/*J. Trag.* 15.
[93] *Gall.* 26/*Charon* 19.
[94] For 'adoxography' as a rhetorical diversion, see A. S. Pease, *CPh* 21 (1926), 27-42; Bompaire 282-286.
[95] *Icar.* 22/*VH* I.28.
[96] *Bis Acc.* 2 f./*Timon* 1-5.

two encounters with Empedocles: near the moon he engages him in polite conversation; but in Hades he exposes him as a charlatan.[97] And Lucian can vary his own 'opinions' or attitudes just as readily. The poor man's lot can equally well be the best of all—or beneath contempt;[98] and Lucian will laugh at statues and cults for Peregrinus, but approve them for the Emperor.[99] The latter case may be self-seeking hypocrisy, but he is equally whimsical about literaature. He can compare his work to a hippocentaur joined gracefully —or incongruously, depending on the context.[100] He condemns the exemplum of Othryades as the rhetorician's last resort, but uses it himself nevertheless;[101] and his Homer is indifferently prince of liars or prince of poets.[102] Many 'views' of this kind have been taken seriously in the past, and scholars still occasionally try to see Lucian concealing his 'real' political opinions under the guise of rhetoric, or undergoing 'spiritual' changes.[103] But there are enough inconsistencies to show that he practised this kind of manipulation as an end in itself. For such a writer attack and defence of Cynics, for example, are merely two different ways of working the same theme: the temptation to indulge in rhetorical ἀνασκευή and κατασκευή is never far away.

Lucian can also vary the context of a theme in another significant way, by working it against a fantastic or contemporary setting. He can present his defence of Satiric Dialogue as a fantastic drama, or as a genial reply to a friendly joke;[104] he can make fun of awful historians by an extravagant burlesque, or by a 'factual' treatise on the present state of historical writing.[105] And his religious satire can equally well take the form of a dialogue with Pythagoras, now transmigrated into a cock, or a memoir of his own campaign against Alexander of Abonoteichos.[106] The same kind of minute detail can appear as fact or fantasy. The charlatan oraclemonger keeps a tame

---

[97] *Icar.* 13 f./*D. Mort.* 20.4; cf. the treatment of Pythagoras in *Gall.* as opposed to *Vit. Auct.* 3 ff., *D. Mort.* 20.3.
[98] *Gall.* 21 ff./*Sat.* 36 ff.
[99] *Peregr.* 41/*Apol.* 13.
[100] *Zeuxis* 6/*Prom. es* 5.
[101] *Rh. Pr.* 18/*Charon* 24.
[102] *Gall.* 17/*Musc. Enc.* 5.
[103] See *infra* 120f.
[104] *Bis Acc.*/*Prom. es in verbis.*
[105] *Verae Historiae*/*Historia.*
[106] *Gallus*/*Alexander.*

snake looking out from behind his beard;[107] the charlatan philosopher has a Maltese lapdog peeping from behind his. And the lapdog in turn has its litter inside the philosopher's beard; in a still more fantastic setting, the men on the Moon can keep their young in their hair-lined stomachs—or the eagle can all but nest on Zeus' head![108]

If Lucian opts for a literary setting, he can use his favourite authors as interchangeable backgrounds for the same motif. Several times he brings a man down to earth again after a futile dream about wealth, and as it stands the motif has an obvious Cyno-Stoic flavour. But Lucian has supplied it with a whole range of different settings. Micyllus complains that the cock's crowing has shattered his dream of inheriting Eucrates' fortune. This is an obvious imitation of Ar. *Nub.* 1 ff., where Strepsiades hears the cock crow, laments his poverty, and wakens his son from one of his aristocratic dreams.[109] But when a 'Platonic' guise is required, Lycinus takes Adimantus out of his (Socratic) meditation between Athens and the Piraeus while his dream is in full sail;[110] or Lucian parodies the *periplous* tradition and describes an Island of Dreams, which bring their victims back down to earth.[111]

Some motifs combine easily, either by nature or through a long history of association in literature: Lucian takes full advantage of the possibilities. Three such motifs may be described as 'miraculous vision', 'views from a vantage-point' and 'spying on immoral behaviour', and all were a well-established part of the second-century moralist's repertoire.[112] Lucian could develop them either separately [113] or in pairs [114] in the most conventional way; but he

---

107 *Merc. Cond.* 34; *Alex.* 15; *D. Mar.* 1.5.

108 *VH* I.24; *Deor. Conc.* 9.

109 *Gall.* 1 cf. 12/*Nub.* 1 ff. A reference to *Nub.* is required at the beginning of Lucian's own satire of quack sophistry.

110 *Navig.* 11/cf. *R* 327A ff., *Symp.* 174D.

111 *VH* II.35.

112 E.g. Max. Tyr. *Or.* IX.6; X.9; XI.6, 10; XII.6; XVI.6; XXXVII.8; XXXVIII.3, and Hobein's parallels *ad loc.*; cf. also Marcus VII.48; IX.30, 32; X.15; XII.24.

113 *Miraculous vision*: the boastful Platonist can see the forms, thanks to his keen sight (*Philops.* 16, *Vit. Auct.* 18); or the Selenites can put in their eyes at will, *VH* I.25. *Views from a vantage-point*: Hermes looks down on the jurors from the Areopagus, *Bis Acc.* 12; the gods look from heaven on the debate between Damis and Timocles, *J. Trag.* 34 ff.; Hermotimus will look down on mankind, *Herm.* 5. *Spying on immoral behaviour*: Lycinus hears

seldom misses an opportunity to combine all three: Empedocles gives Menippus magic vision, so that he can look down from the moon and watch adulterers at work;[115] Hermes gives Charon similar powers, so that he can look down from the mountains and see Tomyris bathing Cyrus' head in blood;[116] or in a less fantastic vein the observant Lycinus [117] spots the gluttonous philosopher Zenothemis from his own place at the party.[118]

Sometimes Lucian's chain of motifs will form a self-contained narrative: there are several variations on the formula 'an influential patron, with a taste for culture, intervenes at the eleventh hour to save a charlatan': Aristippus saves the tyrant Dionysius from being chained to the Chimaera, because he has subsidised the arts;[119] Minos is impressed by the robber Sostratus' display of dialectic, and calls him back from Pyriphlegethon;[120] Odysseus saves Homer from a prosecution by Thersites;[121] and Thucydides protects Xi from the just protests of Sigma.[122] In a contemporary setting we find a Roman governor fond of philosophy releasing the charlatan Peregrinus from prison;[123] or Rutilianus obstructs Lucian's proceedings before Avitus against his ally Alexander.[124] *Plus ça change.*

So too with similes. Lucian will not be content with just one when

---

about Hermotimus' teacher's drunken quarrel from his servant, *Herm.* 11; or about the book-collector from his slave, *Adv. Ind.* 25.

114 *Miraculous vision seen from a vantage-point*: Lucian looks through a telescope on the moon and sees his family on earth, *VH* I.2. *Spying on immorality from a vantage-point*: the sun sees Ares and Aphrodite, *D. Deor.* 17.1; the cock sees Simon from his perch stealing a bowl, *Gall.* 14; the moon watches the wicked philosophers, *Icar.* 20; and in particular Peregrinus, *Fugit.* 1. *Miraculous vision and spying on immorality* (but not from a vantage-point): the corpse of Megapenthes, lying on the floor, watches his servant debauching his mistress, *Katapl.* 12; Micyllus and the cock are able to see Eucrates and his shady goings-on without being seen, *Gall.* 32.

115 *Icar.* 13 ff.

116 *Charon* 7 ff., 13.

117 *Conv.* 11.

118 The three motifs are associated loosely in *Nigrinus* (4, 17-20); Nigrinus has compared himself to a spectator at the theatre, watching the fools on the stage from aloft; this and other illustrations have given Lucian a new clarity of vision.

119 *Neky.* 13.

120 *D. Mort.* 30.3.

121 *VH* II.20.

122 *Iud. Voc.* 9.

123 *Peregr.* 14.

124 *Alex.* 57.

three will do. In *de Mercede Conductis* he compares the Romans to handsome scrolls concealing a gruesome tragedy.[125] Elsewhere he is content to compare pretenders to tragic actors or masks,[126] to a Colossus with rubbish inside, or to the impressive façade of a temple;[127] or he will contrast a beautiful scroll with its unworthy reader.[128] Here he has taken the opportunity to mix them all: a tragic plot behind the impressive façade of a beautiful book![129]

He will also choose situations where as many reminiscences as possible can be made to converge. The Asslegs of *VH* II. 46 draw on two different Homeric freaks, the Sirens and Circe.[130] And Lucian has a talent for exploiting the common ground between several authors. The rival pleas of Sculpture and Education in *Somnium* recall three classic encounters: Aristophanes' battle of the *Logoi*, the Allegory of Prodicus, and Ps.-Cebes' debate between True Education and False.[131] In a similar *syncrisis* in *Rhetorum Praeceptor* he finds room for the *mise en scène* of Plato's *Euthydemus* as well.[132] Even a thoroughly sophistic trifle such as *Iudicium Vocalium* is firmly rooted in several different classics: the consonants in court reflect not only Aristophanes' battle of the *Logoi*, or the word-weighing competition in the *Frogs*; there is room for two separate passages of Plato's *Phaedrus* as well. Socrates had condemned the intrusions of Tau (μανικῄ/μαντικῄ); Sigma takes up the complaint at long length. And Plato's words are unable to defend themselves in court—Lucian's letters can and do![133]

All these techniques are conventional, and Lucian employs them to excess: his methods are as limited as his themes. But when he sets all his procedures to work on the same subject, he can produce some strikingly different developments, and it is worthwhile to trace the ramifications of a single theme. He develops the school simile of the actor *ad infinitum*. It is easy to catalogue all the in-

---

125 *Merc. Cond.* 41.

126 *Icar.* 29; *Tox.* 9; *Rh. Pr.* 12; *Pisc.* 32.

127 *Gall.* 24 f.; *Imag.* 11.

128 *Adv. Ind.* 7; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 185F (speech compared to a patterned rug which can be unrolled); 779C (Dionysius compared to a palimpsest full of erasures).

129 For Lucian's similes see *infra* 121 ff., 173 ff.

130 *VH* II.6/*Od.* XII.39; *Od.* X. *passim*.

131 6-14/Ar. *Nub.* 899 ff.; Xen. *Mem.* II.i.21 ff.; *Pinax* XI f.

132 6-25/*Euthyd.* 274A ff. (the two sophists *à la mode* compete with Socrates for Cleinias).

133 *Ran.* 1365 ff.; *Phaedr.* 244C; 275E.

stances where he compares all the world to a stage; but there are many examples where the material reappears in a rather different form. Lucian will tell how a pretentious actor came to grief, but as an anecdote instead of a simile;[134] he will recast some of the material to illustrate an academic argument (Are Polus and Aristodemus the gods they seem on the stage?);[135] or he will turn Zeus himself into a tragic actor in the opening scene of *Iuppiter Tragoedus*. But he must also present his own personal enemies in this guise: the Pseudologist actually had been an actor,[136] and both Peregrinus and Alexander are presented as actors in their ritual charades.[137] And sooner or later Lucian could not resist applying the charge to himself as well—he expects to be reminded that others will compare *him* to a tragic actor![138] It is easy too to decorate the theme with classical reminiscences: Menippus soliloquises in iambics, complete with a ludicrous set of comic props—like Aristophanes' Dionysus and Dicaeopolis combined.[139] Or the theme will coalesce with others equally flexible. Lucian likes to present foreigners misunderstanding civilised institutions such as athletics or gladiatorial shows.[140] In *Anacharsis*, his Scythian visits a tragic performance, and infers that the audience is distressed because the actors have to wear elaborate costumes![141]

Lucian proves equally versatile in his satire of foreign cults. This is another outworn topic,[142] and most of his variations are entirely predictable.[143] But again he can achieve less mechanical results when he blends the theme with some of his other favourites. At *Imag.* 11 he congratulates Panthea for being unlike women who resemble the magnificent façades which conceal ridiculous animal-

---

[134] *Adv. Ind.* 8 ff./*Gall.* 25.
[135] *J. Trag.* 41 cf. *pro Imag.* 23.
[136] *Pseudolog.* 19.
[137] *Peregr.* 21; *Alex.* 39.
[138] *Apol.* 5.
[139] *Neky.* 1/*Ran.* 38 ff.; *Ach.* 415 ff.
[140] *Anach.* 1 ff.; *Tox.* 59.
[141] *Anach.* 23.
[142] Caster, *Pensée* 384; Bompaire 491 ff.
[143] He attacks the idea of Olympian gods in Egyptian disguise, *Sacr.* 14, with little attempt at embellishment, and uses the theme in combination with some of his other hackneyed subjects. It appears as an ἐκ διαφωνίας at *J. Trag.* 42, with the gods spying from their vantage-point, as they often do (*Timon* 7 ff.; *Icar.* 25 f.; *Fugit.* 1 f.; *Charon* 4 ff.); or the gods fight for precedence on this issue (*J. Trag.* 8 ff.), as on so many others (*D. Deor.* 13, 16, 18); or he simply expands the topic, without adding very much, in *Deor. Conc.*

gods within. Here he has blended together three routine similes which contrast appearance and reality: the courtesan, the colossus with rubbish inside, and the pretentious mask removed.[144] There is also a hint of one of his favourite classics: at Pl. *Symp.* 215B, Alcibiades compares Socrates to the ugly masks of Silenus which contain images of gods inside. Lucian reverses the simile: the containers are impressive, but the contents are repulsive—and the foreign gods are thus made to form the centre-piece of one of his most elaborate comparisons.

The *adynaton* at *Tox.* 2 ff. is a similar combination. When the Scythians run out of gods because of temple-robbers, they will appoint the robbers as gods instead (or perhaps even Phoenician fish-mongers!). There are at least four characteristic motifs here: the ubiquitous temple-robbers,[145] a scarcity of gods,[146] foreign upstarts in the ranks,[147] and the Phoenicians as typical mariners.[148] And Lucian uses the temple-robbers in an equally clever paradox at *Phalaris* I.6: it would be barbarous that temple-robbers should be punished near the temple they have just robbed! Here he develops the paradox further still: it is proper that temple-robbers should be deified at the scene of the crime!

Lucian liked ridiculous oaths, and they gave him plenty of scope for introducing unusual gods. On the analogy of Socrates' oath by Anubis,[149] the Scythian Toxaris must swear by his gods Wind and Scimitar, with Spear and Arrow and finally Hemlock and Halter for good measure! Elsewhere Lucian gives Death a full staff of messengers and servants—ranging from diseases and poisons to judges and tyrants.[150] Here he has only to transfer these rhetorical clichés from an allegorical picture to a comic Scythian pantheon.

But he can also treat the foreign gods in a less sophistic manner. At *Tox.* 28 he begins a romantic tale with the theft of some cups from a temple. Stealing vessels is one of the staple industries in Lucian;[151] but for this one occasion, when the temple is in Egypt,

---

[144] *de Domo* 7; *Gall.* 25; *Icar.* 29, *Neky.* 16, cf. *Tox.* 9.
[145] *Herm.* 37 ff.; *Icar.* 16, 24; *J. Trag.* 25; *J. Conf.* 12.
[146] *Icar.* 9.
[147] *Deor. Conc.*; *J. Trag.* 8 ff.; *Icar.* 27.
[148] *Icar.* 1.
[149] *Vit. Auct.* 4, *Icar.* 9.
[150] *Tox.* 38, cf. *Charon* 17.
[151] *Gall.* 14, *Conv.* 46; cf. *Herm.* 81, in addition to the examples already cited.

he takes the opportunity to add some local detail—this time the robbers take silver figurines of Anubis as well.

Finally, he can enliven his theme by subtly recasting its context. At *Sacr.* 14 the Olympians in Egypt change into animal guises, which Lucian ridicules as a matter of course. But at *D. Mar.* 7.2 two gods look on while Hermes changes into a doghead on arrival in Egypt, and this time Lucian is no longer on the attack: he offers the detail as an extra metamorphosis in the story of Io, without abandoning the nuances of his Hellenistic setting. Hermes performs his quick-change act the moment he has helped Io from a heifer back into a girl! Lucian elsewhere makes sarcastic comments on Egyptian mysteries;[152] here however the spectators agree not to enquire too closely—out of naive piety. One of the satirist's routine targets has been transformed into a decorative and wholly charming detail.

These illustrations are a fair indication of what Lucian is liable to do with his school authors and school techniques. With no real aim besides pure entertainment, he had plenty of scope to work his themes and variations to saturation point. What kind of problem do they help us to solve? In some cases they throw light on traditional questions about his models: there is not much point in inventing more and more lost sources for a passage if he has already used all the material elsewhere. Although his chronology is still unsettled, there are often other factors to help us: we can be sure that no second-century sophist waited till he was fifty before he read about tragic actors or webs of fate—or encountered Plato's *Phaedrus* for the first time. But the real value of studying Lucian's themes and variations lies elsewhere. It enables us to see how he allowed the various strands of his material to interact at every possible opportunity, and it builds up a picture of what appealed to one man and his audience in the most sophisticated literary milieu of the High Empire. Lucian is a highly individual personality in an age of *rhétorique appliquée.* The study of his habits and techniques will show us why he is so much more fluent than his contemporaries in using the literature of the past and the school methods of the present. We can never strictly speaking talk of 'Lucianic' themes, but we should learn to recognise typical 'Lucianic' blends of Plato, Aristophanes and the rest. Reardon has neatly characterised his

[152] *Deor. Conc.* 11; *Sacr.* 14.

work as a 'complexe mécanisme littéraire'. The following chapters attempt to establish just *how* complex and *how* mechanical Lucian is liable to be when the reader does not expect it. It is now seventy years since *Lukian und Menipp*, and nearly twenty since *Lucien Écrivain*: it is time to take *Lukian und Lukian* and *Lucien prestidigitateur* more seriously.

CHAPTER TWO

FANTASTIC DESCRIPTION

Now that we have seen Lucian's leitmotifs at work we should be wary of approaching any single passage without relating it to the rest of his work. I have not set out to discuss every cross-reference in Lucian, a task as infinite as it is pointless. In each of the following chapters we can look instead at typical mosaics of motifs. Most of these have gone unnoticed in the past, and all of them show how thoroughly he could infiltrate any field of his wide interests with cross-references to the most elementary material.

It is in his fantastic descriptions that Lucian has the greatest scope for manipulating motifs.[1] His technique is particularly clear in two of the miniature Utopias in *Verae Historiae*: he has used the most obvious sources, but blends them with some favourite clichés which appear in much more commonplace form elsewhere. In *VH* I.29 he describes his own visit to a city peopled by lamps. The name Lychnopolis may be a parody of Iambulus' Heliopolis,[2] which Lucian has used more extensively in *VH* II; for the city itself, however, he has simply contaminated two passages of Aristophanes, Cloudcuckootown and Trygaeus' meeting with the shooting stars.[3] But this will not account for all the details. He has also found room for material which reappears elsewhere in some of his favourite 'similes of life'. In *Icaromenippus*, *Nekyomanteia*, and *Charon* his other travellers also escape from the earth and compare mankind to choruses, actors, wasps or bubbles. We find accordingly that the lamps have their rich and poor, like the

---

[1] For Lucian's fantasy as a whole, see Bompaire 657-705; for the sources of *Verae Historiae*, *ibid.* 658 ff.; A. Stengel, *De Luciani Veris Historiis*, Diss. Rostock, Berlin 1911, is still a useful catalogue. F. Ollier's Commentary (*Érasme*, Paris 1962), though a school edition, is occasionally serviceable. K. Reyhl, *Antonios Diogenes*, Diss. Tübingen 1969, sets out to make Antonius the central source, but without any reference to Lucian's own literary methods. See *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* c. I.

[2] *Apud* Diodorus II.59.7.

[3] *Av.* 819, *Pax* 838 ff. (Bompaire 668, Caster *Pensée* 289 f.). That Lucian knew the second passage is clear from *Icar.* 13 f., where he alludes to the lines which precede: Menippus meets Empedocles disguised as a burnt cinder, just as Trygaeus sees the fraudulent poet Ion of Chios (*Pax* 835).

wasps in the hive-simile;[4] their own government and bustling cities, like the ants;[5] and even an archon to answer to, as the chorus has its choregus.[6] The lamps are snuffed out, just as the chorus is silenced, the actors sent off, or the bubbles burst.[7] And it is no surprise that in *Anacharsis* Lucian uses the 'lamp put out' as a routine simile in its own right.[8] He also has a conversation with his own lamp, which gives him news from home. This can be taken as an allusion to Odysseus' interview with his late mother.[9] But there is also room for more Aristophanes: Trygaeus had recognised one of the shooting stars as Ion of Chios.[10] And even within *VH* this is neither the first recognition scene nor the last: Lucian meets one of his fellow men on the moon, and two others inside the whale.[11] And he can use personal details to corroborate any kind of nonsense: he is able to see his own family from the moon, or his own couch in the Isles of the Blest—not to mention his own memorial, carved to order.[12]

It is always tempting to assume that when Lucian is in exotic places he must be using exotic sources. We can never rule them out entirely, but it is worthwhile to look first for a simple explanation in a simple author. He has placed Lychnopolis between the Pleiades and Hyades. There is no need to trace the whole episode to an astronomical gazeteer supposedly used by Antonius Diogenes, whom Photius named as Lucian's principal source![13] Lucian himself can supply this sort of corroborative detail in any circumstances: he makes Menippus recite plenty of aetherial nonsense after a trip to the moon; and he is ready with precise locations and exact measurements throughout *VH*.[14] It is equally clear why he puts lamps in the dock. There is no point in com-

---

[4] *Charon* 15. This is an obvious case of converging sources: the rhetorical cliché coincides with a frequent topic in periegetic literature, e.g. Herod. IV.65, Ctesias *apud* Phot. *Cod.* 72.48a; and Aristophanes has already hinted at it in *Pax* 840, where the rich stars come home from dinner with their lanterns.

[5] *Icar.* 19.

[6] *Icar.* 17.

[7] *Icar.* 17, *Charon* 19.

[8] *Anacharsis* 35.

[9] *Od.* XI.174 ff.

[10] Ar. *Pax* 835; *Icar.* 14.

[11] *VH* I.23; I.33.

[12] *Ibid.* I.26, II.27.

[13] As does F. Boll, *Ph N.F.* 20 (1907), 1-11.

[14] *Icar.* 1, 22; *VH passim.*

paring the incandescent souls judged in Plutarch's myth of Aridaeus [15] when we can never be sure that Lucian's philosophical reading stretched far beyond the literary interludes in Plato. He knew the *Gorgias* and *Republic* myths, and fused them in an elaborate satire elsewhere: here he has only to blend two of the minor details: souls which appear ἔνδηλα for judgement, and return to earth as shooting stars.[16] And mock trials or unlikely personification are favourite diversions in sophistic writing.[17] Lucian combines them elsewhere—the false grammarian's tongue and beard turn accusers, and the letter Tau is threatened with crucifixion before the vowels![18]

Accounts of Utopia can be managed in pairs: Apollonius of Tyana's visit to the Egyptians is similar to his visit to the Indians,[19] and Lucian's account of the Isles of the Blest in *VH* II corresponds to his sojourn on the moon in I. To make up his island of dreams in II. 34 ff. he has only to switch his sources and substitute Homer's dreams for Aristophanes' stars. He can then exchange one Cynic simile for another (the pageant of actors for the human anthill).[20] And again there is close correspondence in the details. Instead of a choregus calling back the costumes we have dreams finally bringing their guests back to earth. Lucian's crew naturally lie awake with the lamps and go to sleep with the dreams! And in both passages he makes a point of departing from his model at one particular point. He had had no chance to visit Cloudcuckootown itself, but had described Lychnopolis instead; here however he *was* able to visit Homer's Gate of Dreams, and actually 'corrects' some of the details! And he embellishes his imaginary landscape with appropriate details which are clearly part of his repertoire—springs, oracles, and false dreams themselves are a constant source of fun, and we do not need to search far afield to explain them.[21] Nor can we rule out the possibility that Lucian multiplied the

---

15 Reyhl *o.c.* 50, citing *de Sera Numinis Vindicta* 563F ff.

16 *Gorg.* 524E; *R* 621B. Cf. *Katapl.* 27 f.

17 Bompaire 242 ff.; 261 ff.

18 *Pseudolog.* 25; *Iud. Voc.* 12.

19 Philostratus *VA* VI/II-III.

20 *Neky.* 16/*Icar.* 19.

21 Springs, *VH* I.34, II.13 f., 16; *Bacch.* 6 ff.; oracles, *Philops.* 38; *J. Trag.* 30 f., *Bis Acc.* 1; Alexander, *passim*; and false dreams are a constant source of fun (*Gall.* 6; *Somn.* 17; cf. *Navig.* 11 f., *Herm.* 71).

details in one of these two episodes to correspond to those in the other.[22]

Lucian does not confine his glimpses of Utopia to his fantastic travels; they are just as likely to reappear in second-century Asia Minor in his picture of the Christians. His description of their community in *Peregrinus* 11 ff. is remarkable for its mildness,[23] and eccentric in its details;[24] and it could scarcely have been gleaned from Christian or Jewish texts.[25] He has simply taken the opportunity to present another Utopia in contemporary guise. The parallels with *VH* are obvious: the Christians have universal brotherhood, as the Moonmen have bizarre homosexual ties;[26] they share everything with engaging naïveté, as the Blessed share their wives or the Moonmen their eyes;[27] and they too are ruled by an unlikely stranger who was once a man—a crucified sophist instead of the ravished shepherd who rules on the moon![28] Nor do Christians or Moonmen die in the normal way: the former have their immortality, the latter fade into thin air.[29] The few other details Lucian gives of the Christians were easy to assimilate to his repertoire. They show great devotion to an imprisoned colleague, like the Greek friends despised by the Scythian Toxaris;[30] and they practise ritual taboos, a *bête noire* which he usually reserves for his Pythagoreans.[31] It is no surprise that he should see Christ in exactly the same terms as he sees Prometheus—as a crucified sophist![32]

Other details in *VH* can be related just as clearly to the rest of Lucian's output. In I. 15 the Moonmen make their own battlefield by having a web spun between the moon and the morning star. It is tempting to acclaim this feature as an 'original' creation of Lucian's.[33] But he borrows the blockade of clouds from Aristo-

---

[22] See *infra* chapter VIII.
[23] P. de Labriolle, *La Réaction païenne*, Paris 1934, 108.
[24] Bompaire 479.
[25] For the abortive claims that he did, see Bompaire 480 n. 1; for a discussion of Schwartz' parallels, *infra* 111 n. 67
[26] *Peregr.* 13/*VH* I.21 f.
[27] *VH* II.19; I.25.
[28] *VH* I.12.
[29] *Peregr.* 13, cf. *VH* I.23, II.12.
[30] *Tox.* 18, 31 f.
[31] *Peregr.* 16/*Gall.* 18, *D. Mort.* 20.3 f., *VH* II.28.
[32] *Prom. Cauc.* 4, 20.
[33] Bompaire 665.

phanes' *Birds* only a few sections later, and a battlefield of gossamer is a fairly obvious doublet to a wall of cloud.[34] And he is able to include two other motifs which he developed separately elsewhere. He attaches threads to the moon, just as easily as he attaches a well-rope to the sun;[35] and spiders spin their webs in mid-air, as the Fates sit aloft and spin the web of destiny for mankind in *Charon*.[36] Lucian has only to conflate an obvious classical allusion, a favourite joke, and a moralists' commonplace.[37] And a battlefield has to have its trophies: he thickens the familiar literary texture with a touch of corroborative detail by placing one on the spider's web. He will set them up in any other unlikely spot: a dolphin's spine marks the battlefield inside the whale, or an island serves the same purpose on its back![38]

One of the most elusive parodies is the episode where Lucian's companions are seduced by vinewomen (I.8). They cannot escape this unusual embrace, and find themselves growing into the vine *commissis membris*. Lucian himself compares the women to pictures of Daphne changing into a laurel; and Aphthonius works a routine κατασκευή on the same theme, culminating in a similar paradox ('the earth received the girl and put forth a plant. Both operations are natural, since men fall to the earth and trees grow out of it').[39] Once again however there is room for all Lucian's familiar sources to converge: not only Homer's Lotus-eaters and Herodotus' snake-women,[40] but even a detail from Plato's 'version' of Aristophanes: men used to deposit their seed directly on the earth—the next thing to an affair with a plant![41]

This kind of fantasy was also part of the *periplous* tradition which Lucian parodies throughout *VH*, and most aspects of his version can be paralleled: Philostratus describes piebald women [42] or islands infested with Nereid-harpies;[43] as to plants, Arrian describes thorns which could unseat a cavalryman,[44] and tree-

[34] I.19. Lucian does not omit to mention Nephelokokkugia in due course (I.29) for any who may have missed the allusion.
[35] *VH* I.15/*Icar.* 7.
[36] *Charon* 16.
[37] Cf. Marcus III.11.3; VI.10; Ps.-Cebes *Pinax* 5.
[38] *VH* I.18/I.38, I.42.
[39] Spengel II. p. 32.
[40] *Od.* IX.90 ff., Herod. IV.9 (Stengel, *de Luciani Veris Historiis o.c.* 17).
[41] 191C. Lucian exploits the *Symposium* intensively elsewhere.
[42] Philostratus *VA* III.3.
[43] *Ibid.* III.50, cf. Dio of Prusa *Or.* V.12 ff.
[44] *Anab.* VI.22.7.

women salute Apollonius of Tyana;[45] Achilles Tatius offers a lengthy ecphrasis of two amorous palm-trees married by grafting;[46] and Aelian alludes briefly to a sexual union between the drinkers and the wine, which impregnates the women of Arcadia![47] All these traditions converge in Lucian's version; but for sheer grotesqueness the nearest parallel is still *Aeneid* III.24-48, where Aeneas' crewman Polydorus has been transfixed by spears which then take root as myrtles. Lucian's plants cry out when plucked, Vergil's run blood. The Latin version may well have been invented to fit its context,[48] and on present evidence at any rate we can suspect that Lucian has been equally resourceful. He is particularly fertile in contriving grotesque situations of this kind. At *VH* I.22 there is another combination of sexual plant and human—a luxurious phallus-shaped oak-tree which opens into a man. And Lucian is always interested in adulterers caught *commissis membris*: he wrote two amusing paraphrases on Ares and Aphrodite, imprisoned in Hephaestus' trap,[49] and a whole dialogue about a eunuch caught in the act.[50] He is also interested in grotesque attachments: it is not long before another incontinent sailor, Cinyras, finds himself hung up by the genitals in Tartarus.[51] The vinewomen themselves overlap with two other wonders in *VH*: like the cork-feet they have underparts of wood; and like the inimitable phallonauts they are sexual curiosities of the first order.[52] Since the phallonauts and corkfeet are also related in another way—both are fantastic boat-cum-sailor as well—it is all too clear that Lucian's capacity for variation in this sphere is unlimited.

There are more examples in the 'Menippean' pieces. In *Icar.* 10-15 Menippus himself flies to heaven strapped between an eagle's wing and a vulture's. This hybrid arrangement appears to be unique,

[45] Philostratus *ibid.* VI.10.

[46] I.17.3-5. Numerous other examples of this tradition are collected in H. Rommel, *Die naturwissenschaftliche-paradoxographischen Excurse bei Philostratos, Heliodoros und Achilleus Tatios*, Diss. Tübingen, Stuttgart 1923, 64-71.

[47] *VH* XII.6. Cf. also the bleeding trees of Geryon, Philostr. *VA* V.5.

[48] So R. D. Williams (Commentary, Oxford 1962) *ad* III.19 ff.

[49] *D. Deor.* 15, 17. Stengel *o.c.* 17 compares Ovid's account of Hermaphroditus' intercourse with the nymph Salmacida (*Met.* IV.357-79); Ovid does compare their embrace to grafting, but only during a series of routine similes which are clearly not part of the myth itself; and Lucian does not refer to this story elsewhere.

[50] *Eunuchus* 10.

[51] II.31; cf. *infra* 32 f., 36.

[52] II.4, II.45.

and scholars have tried to explain it.[53] But Lucian contaminates the simplest sources as usual. The key passage is Aristophanes *Aves* 1364 f., where Pisthetaerus gives a visitor a wing in one hand and a feather in the other.[54] Again too there are obvious echoes of *Pax*: Menippus meets Empedocles in flight in *Icar.* 13, just as Trygaeus encounters Ion of Chios;[55] and Menippus' vulture's wing has to match the indignity of the dung-beetle. Moreover Lucian has a taste for elaborate combinations of this sort: in the doublet of this dialogue, *Nekyomanteia*, he overloads Menippus with incongruous props for his descent into Hades.[56] Quaint combinations of animals are an essential part of his repertoire,[57] and so are absurd combinations of feathers: in *Merc. Cond.* he presents a pimp as a vulture with his feathers plucked—by the name of 'little swallow' (Chelidonion)! And the plagiarist's speech at *Pseudolog.* 5 is made up of borrowed plumes, like Aesop's jackdaw.[58] Against this background an eagle-vulture shows how easily several of Lucian's favourite sources and personal fancies can be made to coincide.

One detail has caused needless difficulty. Menippus' left wing (the vulture's) proves weaker than his right. This shows us at once that Plato's *Phaedrus* is part of the literary texture as well. Lucian knew the celebrated myth of the soul's charioteer:[59] his left steed has weak and squalid wings in contrast to the strong noble ones of his partner on the right. Lucian has only to continue the allusion. The Platonic soul beholds its lover, and worships him as a god; Menippus meets Empedocles, and wants to pour him a libation![60] At the sight of its lover the soul sprouts wings. Empedocles produces rather less of a stir, when he merely tells Menippus to flap one wing. There is also room for folk-medicine here.[61] Menippus will become

---

[53] As parody of Mithraic mysteries (Helm *LM* 104 ff., after Dieterich); of Egyptian religion (R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig 1906, 21); or even fantastic allegory (O. Hense, *Festschrift Th. Gomperz*, Vienna 1902, 192; W. Knauer, *de Luciano Menippeo*, Diss. Halle 1904, 28 f.; *contra*, Caster *Pensée* 339 ff., 383 f.; Bompaire 491 ff.).

[54] *Av.* 1364: Helm cites only 1514 ff./*Icar.* 32.

[55] *Icar.* 13 f./*Pax* 835.

[56] *Neky.* 1/Ar. *Ran.* 45 ff.

[57] E.g. *Zeuxis* 4 f., *Prom. es* 4; *VH* I.11 ff.; *Fugit.* 30.

[58] *Merc. Cond.* 33; *Pseudolog.* 5.

[59] *Phaedrus* 253DE. Lucian frequently alludes to the *Phaedrus* Myth (*Pisc.* 22; *Bis Acc.* 33; cf. *Somn.* 15).

[60] *Icar.* 13/251A.

[61] So Helm *LM* 332, cf. Bompaire 691, who compares *Charon* 7, but

sharp-sighted like the eagle, just as Lucian's Eucrates will become swift-footed like the lion in *Philopseudes*; while in *Gallus* Micyllus sees new sights after he has plucked out a cock's right tail-feather. Here Lucian is working another variation on a favourite theme—and turning a sublime classic into an old wives' tale.

There is an equally complex *jeu d'esprit* at *Piscator* 47 ff. The false philosophers have jumped over the edge of the Acropolis; Parrhesiades lets down a fishing-line and catches four philosopher-fish, named with appropriate puns. Some tentative parallels can be produced from Old Comedy (Archippus' puns on fish), or from Timon's *Silloi*.[62] But we should not ignore a whole series of similar developments throughout Lucian's work. Once more he makes use of conventional similes. In *Timon* Ploutos is not the bait but the fish itself, and disappoints his hunters, who duly jump over cliffs;[63] and we also find Menippus himself jumping over the Acropolis at *Icar.* 10. Lucian contrives another set of puns at the expense of philosophers in the dénouement of *Fugitivi* (32); in *Lexiphanes* he includes a pun on the parasite-fish; and there are a multitude of fish-men in *VH*.[64] But the main motif here is yet another case of 'grotesque attachment'—a philosopher dangling at the end of a fishing-line! Lucian emphasises this still more in another variation at *Merc. Cond.* 3: he does not want to see his philosopher friend forcibly dragged along with a hook in his tongue. And he contrives another comparable situation at *Lex.* 20 f.: not bait to fish dreadful puns from the theatre, but an emetic to bring up still worse examples of bad taste from a pedant's stomach! The episode in *Piscator* is clearly the culmination of Lucian's work with all these themes.

Timolaus' day-dream in *Navig.* 42 is a still more comprehensive pastiche. He wishes to outdo Samippus' dreams of empire-building by emulating providence itself. As often Lucian has fused two basic literary sources, in this case Plato's ring of Gyges [65] and Alexander-Romance material: while Samippus concentrates on emulating the historical Alexander, Timolaus will be exploring the Nile and making celestial flights. One might easily mistake much of Lucian's version

---

wrongly concludes that the present passage 'n'est plus typiquement littéraire'. For Lucian's pseudoscience, cf. *infra* 127 ff.

[62] Helm *LM* 303-5.

[63] *Tim.* 20, 26, cf. *Merc. Cond.* 5.

[64] *Lex.* 6, *VH* I.35.

[65] *R* II.259.

for pure fantasy:[66] but again Timolaus' magic ring for opening doors is a doublet of Micyllus' magic feather in *Gallus*;[67] and Lucian has decorated this passage with a number of banal details which appear separately in *Icaromenippus*: the man who prides himself on too many useless rings, flies above the earth, sees exotic countries,[68] finds the answers to philosophers' speculations, reviews battles from above, and has access to other people's bedrooms.[69] Lycinus asks if Timolaus has met a rather quaint snub-nosed old man on his travels (*i.e.* Socrates); when Menippus takes to the air he meets the equally bewildering Empedocles.[70] And Lucian compares both his adventurers to Icarus as a matter of course.[71]

Lucian claims in *Verae Historiae* that his sources are instantly recognisable; in his fantastic writing we have to reckon that his own arsenal of detachable, second-hand motifs is one of them. Time and again he uses the school cliché of the rhetorician and the moralist to enrich a clever contamination of school classics. And in so doing he produces new combinations which can then form part of the repertoire in their own right. It is impossible to make out the chronology of this process: but even within a single book of *Verae Historiae* it is happening all the time. We can only be content to notice one nucleus of fantastic details after another. One thing is clear: we are dealing with an author who will not stop at using a detail once if he can find a place for it again; for Lucian self-pastiche is an end in itself.

These techniques have also to be reckoned with when he is describing fantastic works of art—all the more so when he implies that he has actually seen them. Fictitious paintings were a recognised rhetorical framework for literary fiction,[72] and too often there are cross-references between Lucian's paintings and his other work; in each case we have to suspect that he has produced a synthetic picture of his own.

The portrait at *Heracles* 1-6 is clearly unusual: Lucian claims to have seen a painting in Gaul, depicting the Celtic god Ogmios. An

---

[66] Bompaire 696.
[67] Bompaire *ibid.*, cf. Helm *LM* 338.
[68] *Navig.* 42/*Icar.* 18; 11 ff.; 16.
[69] *Navig.* 44/*Icar.* 6 ff., cf. 20; 16 cf. 18; *Navig.* 42/*Icar* .15.
[70] *Icar.* 13.
[71] *Navig.* 46/*Icar.* 3.
[72] For 'literary' examples see O. Schissel, *Ph N.F.* 26 (1913), 83-114; and Bompaire's full discussion, 707 ff.

interpreter identifies him with Heracles, but in the unlikely role of champion of eloquence; and he drags men's ears by thongs attached to his tongue, to symbolise the power of speech. Several explanations are possible: Lucian could have seen a real picture, which he or his guide has misinterpreted;[73] and it could have been inspired not by native art but by Hellenistic allegorical painting.[74] But he might also have conflated more than one genuine Gallic motif;[75] or improvised the painting entirely to fit his own case—an old man making his return to rhetoric.[76]

There is no doubt that all the ingredients lie well within the rhetorician's milieu: the *mise en scène* is similar to the opening of Ps.-Cebes,[77] and the whole situation is not far removed from several rhetorical similes in Plutarch.[78] There has still been no systematic attempt, however, to relate the picture to Lucian's own special interests. The listeners' ears are attached to Heracles' tongue. Now Lucian is particularly fond of ludicrous attachments. He uses Philosophers hooked by golden bait, or men drawn by the nose as they listen to a story about Hecate.[79] And it is easy to connect people to allegorical figures: Poverty, covered by hooks, is able to attach herself to her victim, or Dialogue is compared to a sea-urchin which people are afraid to take in hand.[80] Here the listeners' ears are bound by chains of gold and amber (3): Lucian has a taste for unusual links of this kind—fantastic chains of spider-web, towropes of roses, or octopuses as grappling-irons;[81] and his

---

[73] J. Martin, *Würzburger Jahrbuch f.d. Altertumswissenschaft* 1 (1946), 359-399.

[74] F. Koepp, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 125 (1919), 38-73.

[75] F. Benoit, *Festschrift R. Egger*, Klagenfurt 1953, I.144-58 (= *Carinthia* 1, 1953, 220-35).

[76] Caster, *Pensée* 362, cf. Blümner, *Archaeologische Studien zu Lucian*, Breslau 1867, 82.

[77] A. Stock, *de prolaliarum usu rhetorico*, Diss. Königsberg 1911, 17 n. 2.

[78] E.g. *Mor.* 507AB: the word as a ship escaping from harbour, so that cables or anchors cannot check it; 536E: Malice as a line with many hooks, and the passions still attached; 536A: men who listen to flattery as amphorae easily carried by the ears (attributed to Bion); also Aelian *VH* XIII.43: Chance depicted as dragging cities into a bird-cage while the lazy general Timotheus is asleep!

[79] *Pisc.* 47 ff.; *Philops.* 23. In the latter case Lucian adds the telling detail that the men worship an unconvincing colossus—precisely as Heracles' admirers are doing here. Stock *o.c.* 17 n. 3 adds *Icar.* 3, *J. Trag.* 45, *Scytha* 11.

[80] *Timon* 29, *Bis Acc.* 34.

[81] *VH* I.18; II. 26; I.41.

philosophers can let down their words as a golden chain.[82] He cites a comic trimeter to account for the piercing of Heracles' tongue (5).[83] And there is also some material in common with his other allegorical pictures: in a painting ascribed to Apelles,[84] he combines two motifs which appear separately here: the listener is willing to be led by what he wants to hear; and he is drawn in an equally grotesque manner—by elongated ears instead of a hook and tongue; or in an allegory of Lucian's own, Rhetoric herself is surrounded by Compliments flying round her from every side, just as Heracles is surrounded by his admiring listeners. Moreover Lucian is interested in incongruous presentations of Heracles—whether posing as Omphale or impersonated by Menippus.[85] Here he compares his hero to Charon or a Titan, and this has been taken to suggest that the picture really represented a Celtic underworld deity.[86] But such a detail might easily be an addition by Lucian: the ferryman appears in an equally unlikely role (on holiday in the upper world) in *Charon* itself.

These parallels make it clear that Lucian had all the material for an exotic picture: whatever he *could* have seen in Gaul, we can suspect that he selected details which coincided with his own tastes. And it seems unlikely that a single painting would have furnished so comprehensive a range of 'characteristic' motifs. Nor would he need to describe exactly anything he did see—his audience had no means of verifying it.

Lucian's monuments are equally suspect. In *Scytha* 2 he prepares for a story about the Scythian Anacharsis by describing the ancient tombstone of his fellow-countryman Toxaris, complete with bow and book. The hero had given Deimainete wife of Architeles the

---

[82] *Herm.* 3, noticed incidentally by Martin *o.c.*, who does not draw any implications. Lucian uses the Homeric golden chain in several unlikely contexts (*J. Conf.* 4 cf. 8; *J. Trag.* 14; *D. Deor.* 21.1).

[83] Kock *adesp.* 398 (Stock *o.c.*). This may be merely a standard tag on eloquence, cf. Eupolis Fr. 94K, *Nigr.* 7, *Dem.* 7.

[84] *Calumnia* 5. This picture may be either misattributed or fictitious (for bibliography see Blümner *o.c.* 42); in any case it is easy to see why it appealed to Lucian: the groups of figures are similar to those which he constructed in imitation of Ps.-Cebes (*Rh. Pr.* 6 ff.; *Merc. Cond.* 42). As to the large ears straining towards slander, cf. the listeners hanging in mid-air by the ears (*Icar.* 4) and the Selenites' large ears of plane-leaves, *VH* I.22.

[85] *Hist.* 10; *Neky.* 1 (with a close verbal parallel Μένιππος ὅλος / ὅλος Ἡρακλῆς *Her.* 1).

[86] Benoit *o.c.*

cure for the Athenian plague, and the tomb has still a cult, which includes the sacrifice of a white horse.

Scholars have usually been content to salvage only a slender amount of fact.[87] The name Toxaris is not found elsewhere,[88] while those of Architeles and Deimainete perhaps fit the subject-matter too closely.[89] Toxaris' book and rites are also suspect, although it is possible to relate the stone to two genuine reliefs excavated from the Dipylon, which Lucian could have misread or embellished for his own purpose.[90]

What is clear is that Lucian had the means—and the motive—to introduce any number of these details himself. For him the Cerameicus or the Dipylon is simply a typical 'Attic' setting;[91] and he can just as easily choose a tombstone in the Cerameicus near the Dipylon as the setting for some erotic graffiti![92] He can also improvise a statue for any occasion, and load it with 'typical' attributes: a bogus orator actually 'decrees' one to Timon, complete with thunderbolt, aureole and seven crowns; or Lucian (wrongly) gives a thunderbolt to the Zeus at Olympia. And in *Philopseudes* he introduces another healing statue, garlands and all, simply to jar with the 'Old Masters' round about it.[93] In Toxaris' case the stele is on the ground, and the inscription is worn away. But Lucian uses overturned tombstones as material for similes, and he could certainly invent unreadable inscriptions: he could only just make out that a stele set up by Heracles and Dionysus was in Greek![94] Again, Toxaris has intervened in a plague: but Lucian is addicted to situations where a foreign quack appears *ex machina*.[95] In one of the highlights of Plato's *Symposium* Socrates mentions an otherwise unknown Diotima who had postponed the plague; here Lucian may be offering a subtle supplement, by inventing a similar

---

[87] Only Blümner, *Archaeologische Studien o.c.* 83 accept it as it stands.

[88] On Toxaris, see Bompaire 703; Hirzel (II.287 n. 2) surprisingly took the name on trust. For the others, L. Sybel, *H* 20 (1885), 47 f.

[89] Sybel *o.c.* 48 f.; L. Weber, *Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Instituts in Athen* 46 (1921), 77 n.

[90] Sybel *o.c.* 51-55; *contra* Weber *o.c.* 79 (an Areopagite Architeles as *toxarchos* ?).

[91] *J. Trag.* 15; *Pisc.* 13; *D. Meretr.* 10.2.

[92] *D. Meretr.* 4.2-3.

[93] *Timon* 51; *Timon* 4; *Philops.* 18.

[94] *Timon* 5, 8 (Bompaire 711 n. 1); *VH* I.7.

[95] *Icar.* 13 f.; *Philops. passim.*

Deimainete who finally put an end to it![96] And streets running with wine are no surprise in an author who uses fantastic rivers of wine or seas of milk![97]

Once more Lucian had plenty of scope for *pseudos*: the stone is said to be in Athens, but he recited the *Scytha* in Macedonia (9); and the remains he describes are so meagre that any audience would be able to give him the benefit of the doubt.

If we cannot trust a tombstone to a Scythian, what about an inscription in the Libyan desert, or a wall-painting in Scythia itself? In *Dipsades* 6 Lucian describes a stele in North Africa, depicting a man racked with thirst from a poisonous snakebite, and comparing him to Tantalus. Lucian's practice elsewhere serves to confirm our suspicions.[98] He is addicted to bogus inscriptions,[99] especially on memorials to men killed by wild animals in exotic places (he provides one for two Scythians killed by a lion, or finds Scintharus' companions buried complete with tombstones inside the whale!)[100] And comparisons with Tantalus and the Danaids are a routine part of any rhetorician's repertoire—as indeed is the whole theme of unquenchable thirst.[101]

In *Toxaris* 6 Lucian's Scythian describes several murals showing the escape of Orestes and Pylades from the Taurians. Here he has used a simpler version of the legend than the tragedians, by making Orestes kill Thoas before escaping. He may have drawn on some literary source which described authentic murals from a Greek Oresteion on the Black Sea: he had only to transfer them to a fictitious Scythian temple.[102] But he may equally well be describing a fictitious picture as a foretaste of the absurd Scythian tales;[103] or he could simply have garbled his own recollections of Euripides.[104] And there is always the chance that he drew on a pictorial version

[96] Weber *o.c.* 78 n. 1. L. exploits the *Symposium* intensively.

[97] *Tox.* 2/*VH* I.7.

[98] Bompaire 688.

[99] *VH* I.7, I.20. Cf. the instances in Apollonius' travels, Philostratus *VA* I.24, II.43. Here the inscription compares the thirsty victim to Tantalus and the Danaids: the comparison is obviously part of his repertoire. He develops a complex analogy between Tantalus and thirsty misers (*Timon* 18); or works out Hermotimus' unquenchable thirst for philosophy at great length (*Herm.* 60 f.).

[100] *Tox.* 42, *VH* I.32.

[101] *Timon* 18, *Herm.* 60.

[102] A. M. Harmon, *LCL* V.104 n. 2; 110 n. 1.

[103] O. Schissel, *Ph N.F.* 26 (1913), 107.

[104] Bompaire 724-5.

he had seen himself. He seems to have been familiar with Amastris on the Black Sea coast,[105] but the picture could have been anywhere. Whatever the source, one banal detail among the few is again characteristic of Lucian. The Scythians try to prevent Orestes' escape by attaching themselves to the ship as it sails and hanging to the steering-oars: we have already seen how readily Lucian depicts people dragged along by some unusual attachment; and elsewhere he makes Micyllus swim out to Charon's boat, while Lycinus threatens to make a miraculous swim to overtake Adeimantus' miraculous ship![106] There is not much scope for fantasy here; Lucian may well be falling back on routine details from his repertoire.

The painting of the female centaur ascribed to Zeuxis is more difficult (*Zeux.* 5 f.). Only Lucian tells us that the original was lost at sea when Sulla sent it to Italy, but that he himself had seen a copy in Athens. While this is not improbable in itself, it is perhaps no warrant for treating his word as archaeological evidence.[107] The subject-matter is again characteristic (a freak animal); and by leaving the details so vague, Lucian may have left room for some embellishments—or selection—on his own account. One notes that the centaur suckles one child as a woman, the other as a mare. This is precisely the kind of hybrid he is prepared to improvise: his Moonmen are both men and women; while Pythagoras the cock may lay eggs and have children![108] And the male centaur appears from his vantage point, to frighten the children by dangling a lion-cub above their heads—just as Athena terrifies the infant Eros with her crest, or Polyphemus disgusts the nymphs by carrying his furry bear-cub.[109] And again Lucian is always interested in unusual objects dangling from above.[110]

The same techniques of pastiche loom large in his battle- and storm-scenes: he had ample precedent for treating both as variations on a theme.[111] The battle-pieces have one distinctive feature in

[105] *Alex.* 57.
[106] *Katapl.* 18; *Navig.* 15.
[107] As does W. Kraiker, *Das Kentaurenbild des Zeuxis, Winckelmannsprogramm der archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 106 (1950), 6.
[108] *VH* I.25, *Gall.* 19.
[109] *D. Deor.* 19, *D. Mar.* 4.
[110] *Supra* 28, 32 f.
[111] Both Aphthonius (Spengel II. p. 47) and Hermogenes (*ibid.* p. 16) cite battles as subjects for ecphrasis. Lucian had every opportunity to see formulae at work in Homer (see for example B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in*

common: Lucian still fits the routine details into some fantastic setting. There are lists of lies reported from the moon; a Scythian's incredible yarn; a wishful day-dream;[112] a *miles gloriosus*' memoirs; and a foreigner's misconceptions about Greek warfare.[113] In the shorter battle-scenes this element of fantasy is still more prominent: Timon gets a citation for bravery in a battle he never attended;[114] or there are battles among the dead, and any number of false reports from lying historians.[115]

In the *prolaliae* Lucian uses the same simple formula for two miniature episodes, at *Bacch.* 1 ff. and *Zeuxis* 8 ff. The lightly-armed Greek side wins an engagement when the barbarians (Indians or Galatians) take fright at their secret weapon (Maenads or elephants) before the first blow.[116] In *Bacchus* the Indians despise the Bacchic rout because of their naked dancers and effeminate costume. Lucian transposes this motif into a different context in *Anacharsis*: the Scythian laughs at Athenian gymnasts, who will meet the barbarians with similar weapons—nakedness or actors' masks and buskins![117]

Lucian uses another simple formula for two combat scenes in the miniature dialogues (*D. Mort.* 27/*D. Meretr.* 13): this time the same thrust of a lance (from a Thracian cavalryman or a Theban knight) kills both the leading barbarian and his horse (the Median governor Arsakes, or a Galatian cavalry commander). On a larger scale the scenes in *Toxaris* and *VH* both consist of a whole sequence of similar details: there is a Greek contingent on the losing side, which outnumbers the victors three to one; both divisions on the one side are suffering reverses and the rout has begun, when an unexpected charge turns the tide; hostages, alliance and tribute are fixed, (but not at once). In the most elaborate battle-scene, *Navig.* 33-38, he has drawn on a cross-section of all the motifs

---

the Iliad, Wiesbaden 1968); for their place in rhetorical tradition, Bompaire 335 ff., and P. J. Miniconi, *Étude des Thèmes guerriers de la poésie épique gréco-romaine*, Paris 1951, 149-151 and index following.

[112] *VH* I.13 ff.; *Tox.* 44 ff.; *Navig.* 28-38.

[113] *D. Meretr.* 13, cf. 9.5; *Bacch.* 1 ff.; *Anach.* 31 ff.

[114] *Timon* 50.

[115] *VH* II.23, cf. *Pisc.* 1 ff.; *Historia* 14 ff.

[116] Lucian may well have known the variant in Ctesias' *Persika* (*apud* Diod. II.19): Semiramis uses dummy elephants against the Indians.

[117] *Bacch.* 1 ff.; *Anach.* 31 ff. Philostratus (*VA* V.8) tells an equally ludicrous version: the Gadeirans naïvely suppose that when Nero has won the tragic contest he must have conquered and captured the Olympians in battle!

mentioned: once more contingents have still to arrive; the result on one wing is indecisive, but the other gives way altogether;[118] and Samippus combines the two separate exploits of the *miles gloriosus* in *D. Meretr.* 13, by killing horse and rider at once and taking the head as a trophy.

When Lucian's motifs and settings are so obviously interchangeable, it becomes futile to speculate about specific sources. It would be tempting to connect the incident at *D. Mort.*[119] 27.3 (Arsakes and his horse transfixed) with Arrian's lost *Parthica*. But this will not explain how Lucian comes to have parallel versions set in Galatia or Persia; and most other incidents in this comprehensive dialogue have doublets elsewhere in Lucian.[120] This particular scene gives him the opportunity to combine three details which reappear separately elsewhere. He has arranged an exotic 'oriental' fight (Thracians v. Cappadocians: in *Kataplous* he uses the Chinamen Indopatres and Heramithras!); he has contrived an incredible wound (we know that Lucian ridicules historians with an appetite for such details);[121] and he has introduced the name Arsakes, one of the few 'Parthian' decorations in his repertoire: in *Icar.* 15 this versatile gentleman reappears as a courtier about to meet his end in a palace intrigue—in an equally bizarre mosaic of motifs.[122]

Samippus' campaign in *Navig.* 28 is a similar synthesis. He begins his rivalry with Alexander as a brigand with first thirty, then three hundred companions, so as to enhance his reputation by starting from scratch. Does the detail come from Arrian's life of Tillorobus,[123] or from *Rauberromantik* in the novel?[124] There is also an obvious doublet in *D. Mort.*, where Hannibal contrasts the humble beginnings of his own military career with Alexander's inherited rank (12.2). In Samippus' case robbery is the obvious way of starting with a few companions. The version in *D. Mort.*

---

118 36, cf. *VH* I.16, *Tox.* 54.

119 H. Nissen, *RhM N.F.* 43 (1888), 250.

120 Helm *LM* 191 f.

121 *Hist.* 20, 29.

122 *Infra* 57 ff.

123 L. Radermacher, *WSt* 33 (1911), 224-232 (Lucian mentions it in *Alex.* 2).

124 There is a good parallel in Charito (VII.3.4 ff.): Chaereas is selected by the soldiers to be captain of a select band of three hundred to take Tyre from the Persians. This is more promising chronologically than Radermacher's parallel from Xenophon of Ephesus.

has the flavour of a rhetorical *controversia*: Lucian could easily have supplied the robbers themselves from the same milieu.

He is less lavish with rhetorical storm-scenes; but his account of the *Isis* and her voyage in *Navig.* 7-9 is of special interest for the history of ancient sailing-ships. Is this a factual account, or realistic fiction? One scholar began his controversial calculations about the ship's tonnage with the uncompromising claim 'Lucian saw the Isis ...'[125], but in his description of the ship (5 f.) there is little besides the three measurements he gives that could not have been supplied from a conventional nautical simile. And there are several inconsistencies to show that the rest may be fictitious.[126]

The worst error is that the Isis is said to double Malea while taking Crete to starboard (9). This is difficult, and the whole question cannot be seen in isolation from Lucian's literary technique. In *Navig.* he sets out to give a 'realistic' ecphrasis of a voyage, in contrast to the fantastic version in *VH*—as well as the fantastic dreams which occupy the rest of *Navigium* itself. This means that he cannot be deliberately absurd, but it does not compel him to verify every detail. It would be an easy matter to piece together a selection of nautical clichés, when he gives even Charon the proper 'apparatus' for a master mariner.[127] And he associates Malea with storms elsewhere;[128] part of the journey is not unlike the beginning of his own voyage in *VH*, where the ship is a day and a night in sight of land, then seventy-nine days off course (I.6); here the crew are twice in sight of land, and the voyage takes seventy days (7, 9); the waves are not much different from those Lucian ridicules in Mnesippus' story;[129] the *Isis* receives St. Elmo's fire, while Lucian's own ship in *VH* is struck by a parodied version.[130] The gods grant deliverance, as they do for Mnesitheus at *J. Trag.* 15. Samippus thought the helmsman was skilful, but Lycinus caustically remarks how far he took the ship off course: in the nautical similes in *J. Trag.* the foolish Timocles thinks that Zeus is a competent

---

[125] L. Casson, *TAPhA* 81 (1950), 43-56.

[126] See G. Husson's Commentary (Paris 1970) II.21 ff.; cf. *J. Trag.* 47 ff.; Bompaire 535.

[127] *Charon* 3, *D. Mort.* 4.1.

[128] *Zeuxis* 3. Cf. Husson *ibid.*, who lists a few more general cross-references. For the same reason one suspects many of the precise details of voyages in Philostratus' 'biography' of Apollonius (Malea again, *VA* III.22, as the 'typical' exploit for a pilot; and a similar ecphrasis of a ship, *ibid.* III.35).

[129] *Navig.* 8. *Tox.* 20.

[130] *VH* II.41, cf. *D. Deor.* 26.

helmsman, but the sceptical Damis shows that things are out of control.[131] And Lucian himself ridicules the highlights of 'shipwreck' stories as cliché-ridden yarns at *Merc. Cond.* 1. In the midst of such blatant pastiche, then, he is not likely to have troubled too much about precise details of trade-winds or sailing-times; and elsewhere the winds provide him with another source of corroborative detail. Zeus gives them their orders for the day, or Notus gives Zephyrus a precise account of his morning's work![132]

There is an obvious unity in Lucian's fantasies, whether they are set on the moon, on faded inscriptions or fictitious monuments, or on the high seas between Alexandria and Athens. We are dealing with a constantly shifting spectrum of standard authors and flexible motifs interacting all the time. They show us that Lucian is a writer of habit, developing the same kind of possibilities in every situation. We cannot ever be too specific about either sources or chronology. When he sets up his stele on the Islands of the Blest with an inscription carved by Homer, we can say with complete confidence that this is 'Lucianic'—even if this was the first work he wrote and we suspect a model in Ctesias.

---

131 *Navig.* 6, 9/*J. Trag.* 46, 49.
132 *Icar.* 26; *D. Mar.* 15.1.

CHAPTER THREE

STORYTELLING

In his fantasies Lucian had a free hand. When he turns to story-telling it is even more difficult to disentangle what he has done with his material. We should never underestimate the role of rhetoricians' handbooks in a sophist's education;[1] but the novice in the schools was also allowed to improvise *muthoi* of his own: he could take some of his material from tradition, some from his own reading; but the rest he could invent for himself.[2] The same rule applies to *diegemata*, except that the writer had to confine himself to what was credible.[3] This would certainly not oblige Lucian to preserve the details of a traditional story exactly as he found them.

Often he uses a story merely to 'prove' a point, in the same way as he would use a proverb or quotation. Any elaboration will be incidental, and he tells the story of Gelo's bad breath or Alexander's architect in the same perfunctory way as Plutarch or Aelian.[4] Bompaire therefore suggests that there is more school technique than personal taste in Lucian's anecdotes.[5] But even the most cursory story often reflects his interests in a revealing way. In *Rhetorum Praeceptor* 5 he tells the tale of a Sidonian merchant who comes to Alexander as the king is wondering how to rule in Egypt and fight in Babylon at the same time. The merchant has local knowledge and offers a quick short-cut which Alexander refuses. This could be a typical apophthegm from the Alexander-historians,[6] but it also embodies two essential motifs from Lucian's repertoire. He often makes fun of people who try to be in two places at once or take fantastic shortcuts: it is difficult for Zeus to watch the battle at Babylon and dine in Ethiopia at the same time; or Lycinus

---

[1] Bompaire 443 ff.

[2] Theon, Spengel II.76.

[3] *Ibid.* 79.

[4] *Herm.* 34/*Mor.* 175BC (with Hiero for Gelo); *pro Imag.* 9/*Mor.* 335C-E; *Vita Alexandri* 72.

[5] 444. But he concedes that Lucian could use as an anecdote material which is attested elsewhere as a proverb (*Herm.* 55, Bompaire 443); that ancient anecdotes had some interchangeable elements (447), or that Lucian had a taste for apophthegms about Classical or Hellenistic artists or rulers (453).

[6] Bompaire 453 n. 2.

attacks fools who want to fly from Greece to India in one day, or announce the name of the Olympic champion in Babylon.[7] Moreover, Lucian's dialogues are full of unlikely guides emerging *ex machina* to provide fantastic shortcuts: Orpheus, Empedocles, Toxaris, Paideia or even Dreams are just as likely to offer their services![8]

Many anecdotes can be reduced to a few situations which he is able to decorate with any time, place, or person. Sometimes handbooks of exempla do contain parallel stories,[9] but this cannot be taken as proof that Lucian always drew whole groups of anecdotes from them: such aids could equally well stimulate the rhetorician to embellish familiar material along similar lines himself.

One motif will show how flexible the rhetorical anecdote has become. Many of Lucian's tales are about 'pretentious disguise', and he has a considerable repertoire of conventional examples, in various forms—ecphrasis, proverb, comparison or fable: there is not much difference between Omphale in Heracles' costume; Thersites in Achilles' armour;[10] ubiquitous similes of statue or actor;[11] and the ass or ape in lion's skin.[12] To produce an anecdote Lucian has only to extend the formula slightly ('a pompous idiot in elaborate guise makes a fool of himself in public'), and add a setting at some court, theatre, or games. At court the bald Stratonice will wear a wig and expect encomia of her hair; or the ugly Pyrrhus will see himself as Alexander and expect others to do likewise.[13] At the Panathenaic Games the audience teases a fop for wearing coloured clothes; or the Hellenodikai overturn statues of athletes larger than life-size.[14] And it is easy to make this motif into a *syncrisis* between skill and sloth: the beautiful Alcaeus is defeated in the pancratium by the ugly Nicostratus.[15] Any of the professions

[7] *Bis Acc.* 2; *Herm.* 71, *Navig.* 44.

[8] *Fugit.* 29; *Icar.* 13; *Scytha* 5; *Somnium* 15; *VH* II.34.

[9] Aelian occasionally cites similar material side by side: prominent men who have lost their sons, *VH* III,3-5; craftsmen who ignore the crowd, XIV.8; men liable to be remembered not for themselves but for the works of art they commissioned, XIV.16 f.

[10] Omphale, *Hist.* 10 cf. Plut. *Mor.* 785E; Thersites, *Adv. Ind.* 7 cf. Plut. *Mor.* 59B; and the treatment of Patroclus, Max. Tyr. *Or.* XXX.3 f.

[11] E.g. *Gall.* 24 f., *Neky.* 16.

[12] *Pisc.* 32, *Philops.* 5.

[13] *Pro Imag.* 5; *Adv. Ind.* 21.

[14] *Nigr.* 14; *pro Imag.* 11.

[15] *Hist.* 9.

will fit the formula—Plutarch applies it to artists, while Maximus of Tyre combines it with the Platonic similes of the ship and the pilot;[16] and Lucian's most elaborate workings may well be his own.

His simplest version is at *Hippias* 2, where he draws a routine contrast between doctors and musicians who practise their profession and those who merely talk about it; Plutarch applies the same formula to artists and critics.[17] At *Adv. Ind.* 29 f. Lucian has worked two elaborate variations. Incompetent doctors make fools of themselves when they cannot heal the patient despite their elaborate instruments, and the experienced doctor with the rusty knife humiliates them (!). This is similar to several of Plutarch's versions: physicians attract their customers by performing operations in public theatres, or the amateur doctor uses a lancet to cut the hair and nails of a patient suffering from tumours and abscesses.[18] In Lucian's second version the motif is applied to barbers instead—charlatans with expensive apparatus are humiliated when the public use their mirrors but go next door to the skilled barber to have their hair cut![19] Again this tailpiece can be made to fit any situation: in Plutarch kings provide the chorus or the banquet, but the people regard the wise man as the true statesman; or Callias or Alcibiades pays the bill, but the guests listen to Socrates![20]

There is a still more elaborate version of this versatile school theme. The *ad Herennium* cites the performer with extravagant equipment and no skill as an example of simile;[21] Aelian turns it into a *syncrisis* between two musicians, and adds a pompous piece of moralising.[22] In *Adv. Ind.* Lucian combines and elaborates both motifs at great length.[23] The rich amateur Evangelus makes a fool of himself when he is whipped off the stage, while the poor professional Eumelus gets the prize. This is basically another doublet of the doctors or the barbers, and Lucian even adds a fourth variation immediately afterwards (Neanthus is torn to pieces when he tries to play Orpheus' lyre). But why should he single out this version for such lengthy treatment? It gave him an opportunity to fuse

---

16 Plut. *Mor.* 802B, Max. Tyr. *Or.* XXX.3.
17 *Mor.* 58DE.
18 *Mor.* 71A, 60B.
19 *Adv. Ind.* 29.
20 Plut. *Mor.* 823CD; *ibid.* DE.
21 IV.xlvii.60, cf. Xen. *Mem.* I.vii.2.
22 *VH* IV.2.
23 *Adv. Ind.* 8-10.

a number of overlapping themes: the fool's artistic debut is a disaster—just as Harmonides blows too hard on his pipe or Lucian himself chips his block too hard;[24] Evangelus makes his exit like the pretentious tragic actor falling off the stage;[25] and his performance is similar to Polyphemus' disastrous excursion on the lyre.[26]

One of Lucian's variations is much more difficult to parallel: the story of the cripple who wears foppish shoes on his artificial legs![27] There is the usual hint of a rhetorical tradition: Plutarch[28] knows that an elaborate shoe is not a cure for gout.[29] But here again Lucian's caricature should be related to the simile of the tragic actor: one of them has a buskin on one foot, a slipper on the other;[30] and Lucian will laugh at any fantastic footwear, on men with feet of cork, or Paphlagonian priests in brogans.[31] There is also a related anecdote at *pro Imag.* 4, where a short-legged woman listens to encomia of her height.

These examples suffice to show the flexible nature of Lucian's material. Sometimes it is obvious why he chooses a particular version, or introduces a minor alteration of his own. Pliny and Aelian cite two different versions of a story about the artist and his critics: Apelles listened in secret to his viewers, then altered his paintings accordingly; or Polyclitus painted two pictures, one to incorporate the silly alterations suggested by viewers, the other to ignore them.[32] But in Lucian's version at *pro Imaginibus* 14, it is the sculptor Phidias who alters his work in response to criticism. Lucian may simply have fallen back on the most popular artists' name,[33] though the story is absurd when applied to a sculptor. But it also suits his context better. He is writing an apology for *Imagines*, where he has cast himself in the first instance as the artist who moulded five *statues* into one (4-7).

[24] *Harm.* 3, *Somn.* 3.
[25] *Gall.* 26.
[26] *D. Mar.* 1.4, cf. *D. Meretr.* 14.4.
[27] *Adv. Ind.* 6.
[28] *Mor.* 465A.
[29] Aelian (*VH* IX.14) mentions Philetas' leaden shoes, made to weigh him down against the wind.
[30] *Hist.* 22, *Anach.* 23.
[31] *VH* II.4; *Alex.* 39.
[32] *NH* XXXV.84 f.; *VH* XIV.8. The motif is by no means fixed in anecdote form: Plutarch uses the artist re-touching a picture as a simile, *Mor.* 452F-453A.
[33] For Lucian's canon of artistic names, see Bompaire 344 ff.

He has done the same with the story of the bald ruler's wig. Aelian cites a simple version, where Agathocles of Sicily has a wig which the Syracusans dare not mention.[34] But Lucian has put his story into the mouth of Panthea, in the course of a tirade against flattery.[35] The subject is now a queen, and Lucian's obvious candidate is Stratonice,[36] who is made to institute a typical competition for flatterers.[37] His interests are equally clear when he turns to *bons mots* about gay clothing in public. In Aelian Socrates warns Xanthippe against it, or Diogenes laughs at effeminate athletes at festivals.[38] But Lucian produced his examples to fit Nigrinus' comparison between Rome and Athens: it is now the Athenians who take pity on the rich fop who dresses flamboyantly at the Games; and in a doublet set at the baths, we find a rich Roman taking a whole army of retainers in with him; this in turn reflects Lucian's interest in comic battles: his Scythian visitor threatens to draw his dagger against the gymnasium.[39]

One pair of doublets is particularly instructive: Lucian tells a story about performing monkeys which abandoned their tricks when one of the spectators threw them nuts or figs. Here he has provided two versions, with completely different details,[40] just as Hermogenes offers two different workings of a routine fable to illustrate the most elementary kind of *progymnasma*.[41] He probably modified his second version to fit a particular occasion,[42] since he cuts down the number of monkeys to one (to compare to himself) and changes their owner from an unnamed Egyptian king to Cleopatra (whose name would mean more to his Roman addressee).[43] He could have found the fable already expanded from the proverb πίθηκος γὰρ ὁ πίθηκος . . . κἂν χρύσεα ἔχῃ σύμβολα (*Adv. Ind.* 4),[44] or he could have devel-

[34] *VH* XI.4.
[35] *pro Imag.* 5.
[36] Cf. *Icar.* 15; *Hist.* 35.
[37] Cf. *Timon* 45-58, *Merc. Cond.* 35.
[38] Aelian *VH* VII.10; IX.34.
[39] *Nigr.* 14 (games); *ibid.* 13 (baths)/*Anach.* 33.
[40] It is not very likely that Lucian 'improved his knowledge' of the anecdote before the second version, as M. Kokolakis suggests (ΠΛΑΤΩΝ 11, 1959, 25).
[41] Spengel II.3-4.
[42] As Kokolakis rightly suggests, *ibid.*
[43] There is a similar version in Gregory of Nyssa (*de prof. Christ.*, Migne *PG* III.240C). Either both writers used a handbook (Crusius *RhM* 49, 1894, 301), or Gregory could have taken the same liberties with Lucian's versions as he does himself.
[44] For Lucian's use of proverbs about animals, cf. Bompaire 452.

oped it himself. Both his versions are variations on the 'pretentious performer' motif, this time in animal guise; Lucian likes unusual events at the theatre;[45] and the monkeys are lured by bait to betray themselves, just like the philosopher or the flatterer.[46]

There is a similar convergence of motifs in the story of the black camel (*Prom. es* 4): Ptolemy is forced to dispose of the beast after it has emptied the theatre—in spite of its gorgeous attire. Once more an animal puts the show into chaos despite its exotic dress; it has to be discarded, just like the unhappy Eumelus;[47] it spreads an unusual madness among the audience; and again we have a wild beast terrifying all who face it for the first time, as in the comic battle-scenes.[48]

For the same reasons we should be suspicious of Lucian's story about the Pharos of Alexandria. In Pliny's version Ptolemy allows the architect Sostratus to inscribe his name; but here he conceals it in a layer which will only appear when the king's name has worn away.[49] Lucian's account could have arisen from a genuine local tradition which grew up to explain why part of the inscription had disappeared—or the story might even be true as he tells it.[50] Whether he adapted it or used a current version, it certainly reflects his characteristic interests once more. Tales about dubious inscriptions are second nature to him;[51] and so are proclamations which are later emended.[52] He also knows the motif of the stone-worker who provides for alterations even after his work is on show (Phidias adjusting his statue);[53] or the courtier who removes all traces of a king after his death (Megapenthes' successor has his statues pulled down).[54] And here as so often the story incorporates material from a favourite simile—the real quality of a colossus is behind the façade (at *Gall.* 24 he compares a king to the pretentious statue filled with rubbish).

---

[45] *Hist.* 1; *Harm.* 3; *Pseudolog.* 19.

[46] *Pisc.* 41 ff.; *Timon* 45 ff.

[47] *Adv. Ind.* 9.

[48] *Hist.* 29; *Zeuxis* 8 ff.; *Bacch.* 4.

[49] *NH* XXXVI.83/*Hist.* 62.

[50] Homeyer, *Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, Munich 1965, *ad loc.* Francis Johnson successfully perpetrated this trick at Bloody Bridge, Dublin. See *The Irish Builder*, Sept. 15th 1879, 291.

[51] *Supra* 33 ff.

[52] *Infra* 104 ff.

[53] *Pro Imag.* 14.

[54] *Katapl.* 11.

In several of the anecdotes about Alexander it is even less possible to disentangle the anecdote tradition from Lucian's variation. At *Historia* 12 the King tears away a foolish panegyric from Aristobulus, with an appropriate *bon mot* against flattery. The motif turns out, however, to be a very flexible one in anecdote tradition: Alcibiades strikes the master who has no text of Homer; Berenice snatches Ptolemy's execution list because he is not giving it his full attention; or Ecprepes cuts strings from Phryne's lyre because he is murdering music.[55] Alexander sometimes appears in this kind of situation, but in a completely different setting: Lysippus the sculptor carves him holding a spear, and rebukes Apelles for painting him with a thunderbolt.[56] And we find the same degree of variation in Lucian's own versions: the Cynic Demetrius is just as liable to snatch a copy of Euripides' *Bacchae* from a fool;[57] or in two other stories Alexander attacks a flatterer, but without throwing any books: he rebukes the architect who wants to carve Athos into his likeness, or lectures Onesicritus about flattery.[58] Both Lucian's apophthegms in turn are rather reminiscent of an anecdote in Plutarch's *Alexander*, in which Lysimachus exposes Onesicritus' untruths after Alexander's death.[59] We can note two features in the midst of this tangle. Lucian's versions tend to fit their contexts very comfortably: Alexander, the cynosure of historians, discards a history-book, just before Lucian launches an attack against bogus historians (*Hist.* 12); and Demetrius tears up a beautifully produced tragedy, when Lucian is denouncing a spendthrift who collects books by the yard (*Adv. Ind.* 19). He may simply have chosen well, but he may also have adapted versatile material to fit his text; and in *Hist.* 40 he may have preferred to give a *bon mot* to Alexander in person rather than to the much less 'authoritative' Lysimachus. Secondly, the details of Lucian's versions do include characteristic material: Aristobulus gives Alexander a single combat with an elephant, and the king attacks him: this is a doublet of one of Lucian's 'comic battles',[60] where the orator Demeas congratulates Timon for his fictitious part in a battle, and is duly beaten up;[61]

---

[55] Plut. *Mor.* 186E; Aelian *VH* XIV.43; Plut. *Mor.* 220C.
[56] Plut. *Mor.* 360D.
[57] *Adv. Ind.* 19.
[58] *Hist.* 12/Plut. *Alex.* 72, *Mor.* 335C, Vitruvius II.1 ff.; *Hist.* 40.
[59] *Hist.* 12, 40/*Alex.* 46.4.
[60] *Supra* 36 ff.
[61] *Timon* 50 ff./*Hist.* 12.

and at *Hist.* 40 Alexander is to come up from Hades to find out how later generations view him, just as the ancient philosophers return in *Piscator.* In the light of these possible adjustments by Lucian himself, we can scarcely trust him as evidence for the later reputation [62] or chronology [63] of either Onesicritus or Aristobulus: we can suspect that if he attaches one anecdote to Onesicritus, he will not be above assigning another one to some other courtier for variety or caprice, whether it is strictly in character or not. Moreover Lucian's repertoire of anecdotes is full of historical oversights of this sort.[64]

If he can tamper with 'textbook' anecdotes, he has much greater scope for this kind of *plasma* in the imaginative dialogues. At *Conv.* 20 the doctor Dionicus reports how he was detained by a mad musician. He escaped by challenging the man to a flute-playing contest, in which the loser was to be whipped. After playing badly, he handed the flute to his captor and disarmed him. Now Lucian's other interlude in *Conv.* is a mock-epithalamium which is obviously his own (41); there is no reason why he should not have made up the story as well. Some of the ingredients were clearly suggested by Plato's *Symposium*: Lucian needs to give his doctor a trifling tale to contrast as much as possible with Eryximachus' dull speech, and Alcibiades had compared Socrates' flute-playing to that of Marsyas;[65] here the cunning doctor has re-enacted Marsyas' famous contest himself. For the rest, a madman forces the doctor to play the flute, as the tyrant forces a philosopher to play the cymbals at *Calumnia* 16; as regards the 'action'—cheating a performer by appealing to his conceit—Lucian would only have to recollect the fable of the fox and the cheese[66] and translate it into human terms. At the same time he had the opportunity to indulge his usual interest in eccentric performers [67] and curious exorcisms.[68]

---

[62] L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander*, New York 1960, 87 and n. 19.

[63] See the problem discussed by J. R. Hamilton *ad* Plut. *Alex.* 46.4.

[64] See S. Walz, *Die geschichtlichen Kenntnisse des Lukian,* Diss. Tübingen 1921, 19-26. Walz also includes a list of minor rhetorical exaggerations in the historical anecdotes (26-34), but without reference to Lucian's practice elsewhere. Apart from the brief survey in Bompaire (443-68), there is no study of Lucian's anecdotes as a whole: a full-scale treatment is needed.

[65] 186A; 215B.

[66] E.g. Babrius 77.

[67] *Hist.* 1; *Pseudolog.* 5-7, 19; *Adv. Ind.* 8-10; 11-12.

[68] *Philops.* 16, 31; *VH* II.18.

He can just as readily produce an anecdote based on Aristophanes. At *Hermotimus* 81 Lycinus tells the story of a young man who is in trouble with his teacher for being sixteen days overdue with his fees. The young man's uncle intervenes to complain: his nephew has little to show for his good education, since he has raped Echecrates' daughter and beaten his own mother when she caught him stealing a wine-jar; and he bores the family at meals with Stoic fallacies. This is an obvious fusion of two passages of Aristophanes' *Clouds*: Strepsiades quarrels with his debtors; then his son, educated at the *phrontisterion*, sings an obscene song and beats his father, who complains to the Clouds.[69] There is still room for clichés which can only have come from Lucian's repertoire: the student bores his family with fallacies at table, as Thesmopolis bores Micyllus in *Gallus*;[70] and the overdue debts are sixteen days late[71]—a typical 'Lucianic' number, as Echecrates is a typical name.[72] As to the stolen wine-jar, Lucian is a specialist in petty theft: this is simply a substitute for the usual cups, bowls, and goblets.[73]

Lucian's best-known tales are in the two large collections *Philoppseudes* and *Toxaris*, where he concentrates on magic and adventure respectively. I have studied these works in detail elsewhere.[74] Here it will be sufficient to show that the magic and adventure provide only a starting-point for his own embellishments. The first tale in *Toxaris* is typical (12-18): any combination of absurd adventures is in order, so long as they illustrate typically Greek as opposed to Scythian activities. The faithful Agathocles stands by the foolish Deinias throughout his career of extravagance, adultery, murder and imprisonment. Plutarch tells a similar story of a man who shares half of his estate with his dissolute elder brother.[75] Lucian can easily attach his usual material to such an elementary motif. Here he combines a scandalous intrigue with the theme of *kolakeia*: Deinias' parasites desert and return, just like Timon's;[76] and the minor details are just as obviously a part of Lucian's repertoire:[77]

---

[69] *Nub.* 1178 ff.; 1353 ff.
[70] *Gall.* 11, cf. *Conv.* 39.
[71] Sixteen vultures, *D. Mort.* I.1; *Prom. Cauc.* 20.
[72] Echecratides is Timon's father, *Tim.* 50; for Eucrates-Eucritus, cf. Bompaire 701 f.
[73] *Icar.* 16; *Gall.* 14; *Conv.* 46; *Tox.* 28; *Herm.* 39.
[74] *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* c. II.
[75] *Mor.* 484AB.
[76] *Tox.* 16/*Timon* 45 ff.
[77] For the names, see *infra* 51.

he dwells on Deinias' infatuation and Charicleia's tricks (13-17), the kind of motifs which are everywhere in *D. Meretr.* There is one additional refinement: Deinias has to embrace her statue as well—like the lover of Praxiteles' Aphrodite in *Imagines.*[78] Here apples and wreaths are not good enough to be lovers' gifts (15);[79] in *Anach.* 9 they serve as contemptible prizes for athletics. The lover's adultery is discovered, a perennial theme in Lucian;[80] and Agathocles supports Deinias in prison (18, cf. 30 ff.), as the Christians support Peregrinus.[81]

Lucian has concocted two similar intrigues in *VH*, and they can be analysed in the same way. Before he leaves the Islands of the Blest, Odysseus gives him a message for Calypso, offering to take up her old offer (II.29); and she gets the answers she wants to hear about Penelope's reputation. This is not just an 'original' supplement to Homer.[82] Lucian has combined an established topic of fun—Penelope's chastity [83]—with one of his favourite devices, the 'casual messenger': Menippus obliges the moon by taking a message as he passes; Pollux takes the message from Diogenes to Menippus when it happens to be his turn to go up; or Hermes has to call on the Cyclops to pick up a thunderbolt after delivering Ploutos, or deal with lover's errands at short notice.[84] Here Lucian himself combines both roles in person—the passing traveller and the lover's accomplice. There is also a doublet of this passage in a 'contemporary' setting: here Lucian discusses Penelope's chastity (εἰ σωφρονοίη) with Calypso after she has received her lover's letter (II.36); so too at *Merc. Cond.* 36 the philosopher resumes his lecture on chastity after the mistress has read her lover's *billet-doux*!

Lucian supplied the details of Helen's elopement with Cinyras in the same way (*VH* II.25 f.): as usual there are intrigues at

---

[78] *Tox.* 15/*Imag.* 4.

[79] J. Schwartz (*Biographie* 37 f.) takes the withered garlands and lovers' apples as a direct borrowing from New Comedy, on the grounds that they reappear in Alciphron, who made extensive use of Comic material elsewhere. But Alciphron may simply be drawing on Lucian here, as he frequently does; and all Lucian needs is a stock of vaguely 'Hellenistic' erotic motifs to manipulate, as in *D. Meretr.* (cf. Bompaire 207 n. 1).

[80] E.g. *Gall.* 32, *Icar.* 15, *D. Deor.* 17. For adultery in rhetorical tradition, see Bompaire 341; for Lucian's use of exposure scenes in general, *infra* 106 ff.

[81] *Peregr.* 12.

[82] Bompaire 671 f.

[83] Seneca *Ep.* 88.8; Plutarch, *Gryllus*, *Mor.* 988B.

[84] *Icar.* 20 cf. Ar. *Nub.* 607; *D. Mort.* 1.1; *Timon* 19; *D. Deor.* 24.2.

table;[85] Cinyras' father would have opposed such an affair, as Glaucias' father does in *Philops.* 14; Lucian is asleep in the dining-room, like Menippus in heaven;[86] Cinyras is just on the point of escape from the whole area of the Isles of the Blest, just as Megapenthes all but slips out of Hades;[87] Helen is visibly embarrassed, like Aphrodite caught with Ares by Hephaestus.[88] And once again there is a 'contemporary' doublet: Radamanthus here punishes Cinyras in Hades after he has taken three companions off on a sexual adventure with Helen; in *Fugitivi* 33 Hermes has Cantharus hung up on Haemus after he takes two present-day Cynics off on a *ménage à quatre* with someone else's wife. Even in the episodes which Bompaire regards as 'les plus séduisants', Lucian's stock of versatile motifs is well to the fore.

It is just as easy to decorate this kind of material with magic paraphernalia.[89] The story of Chrysis and Glaucias in *Philops.* 14 is a typical *plasma*. The philosopher Cleodemus co-operates with his pupil, who is involved in adultery, and arranges for a magician to summon the beloved by a magic ritual. Lucian's version can be compared with a Christian version preserved in pseudo-Cyprian;[90] it is clear that he has started out with little more than the motif of 'summoning' by magic. The simpler the outline, the more room for his own pastiche. Even the names are similar to those in the little intrigue in *Toxaris*: in place of Deinias, Charicleia, Demonax and Agathocles, we find Glaucias, Chrysis, Demeas and Alexicles. Once more Lucian has introduced a philosopher who connives at his pupil's dubious escapades because it suits his own pocket, just like Hermotimus' teacher.[91] He hires a magician to perform ceremonies after the new moon over a trench: Lucian merely annexes the standard details from 'rhetorical' magic, as he does in *Nekyomanteia*,[92] where Mithrobarzanes takes Menippus down to Hades. The moon puts on an exhibition of changing shapes, like Proteus in *D. Mar.*[93] And apart from the irrelevant philosopher,

---

[85] *D. Deor.* 5.2, 6.2.
[86] *Icar.* 27.
[87] *Katapl.* 4.
[88] *D. Deor.* 17.2.
[89] See my *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction*, c. II.
[90] Cf. L. Radermacher's discussion, *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Wien*, 106.4 (1927).
[91] *Neky.* 7-9.
[92] *D. Mar.* 4.
[93] *Herm.* 82.

he also includes a 'New Comic' father, who flies into a rage and will not consent to his son's amours—just as Scintharus objects to his son's eloping with Helen![94] Lucian points out that Chrysis is really a courtesan, one of his favourite types; and he adapts a *bon mot* of his teacher Demonax: money is the only magic needed to summon this kind of lover![95] He also assembles a whole collection of magic decorations which have all to be put back afterwards. There is a doublet in *Charon*: Hermes has to take Pelion, Parnassus and Oeta back down from the top of Olympus.[96]

Philopseudes is an artificial collection of tales. But what happens when Lucian transfers his magic paraphernalia to a real event? He describes the suicide of Peregrinus (*Peregr.* 36), and tells us that he amused himself at the expense of the master's dupes by improvising a sequel to it—a vulture rising from the pyre with a human cry! Now similar apotheoses do occur in 'aretalogical' literature, including Philostratus' *Life* of Apollonius of Tyana.[97] Scholars have therefore tried to establish a literary source behind Lucian's account, even to the extent of attributing a lost version to Peregrinus' disciple and publicist Theagenes, with whose speech Lucian's own narrative begins.[98] Various unusual details in Lucian have been used to 'explain' Peregrinus' behaviour; but too many of them can be accounted for in other ways.

The vulture itself is usually taken as a parody of Imperial apotheosis,[99] in which an eagle would ascend from the pyre. But Lucian has no real motive for this. Peregrinus had certainly no time for Emperors,[100] and Lucian himself has only the perfunctory interest in Rome we should expect.[101] It is still less likely that he was quoting a genuine belief of Peregrinus about the vulture as the bird of the other world:[102] he admits that he seized on the incident

---

[94] *VH* II.25.
[95] *Dem.* 23.
[96] *Charon* 24.
[97] *VA* VIII.30.
[98] *Peregr.* 3 ff.
[99] So D. M. Pippidi, *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 21 (1948), 102; Schwartz, Commentary[2], Paris 1963, *ad loc.* (after Cumont *RHR* 62, 1910, 135).
[100] *Peregr.* 18.
[101] *Infra* 85 ff.
[102] Holland *o.c.* 211. (The same argument applies against Lucian's intending the vulture to be the 'appropriate' bird of Heracles: at this point he has to produce something unheroic and incongruous).

as an opportunity for parody. And elsewhere in his own work the vulture is an ignoble creature—it can serve as a metaphor for a depilated boyfriend, or a surprise substitute for Trygaeus' dung-beetle.[103] As far as Lucian is concerned, the eagle is the bird of Zeus;[104] Theagenes has impiously compared his master to the god, but when he tries to ride to heaven he turns out to be a less royal kind of bird—it is neither an eagle nor a Phoenix[105] that rises from the pyre! And Menippus had misgivings about how *his* vulture outfit would be received in heaven.[106] Lucian might also be parodying the epigram on Plato's soul flying to heaven as an eagle: Peregrinus is a less noble species of philosopher![107]

Theagenes promised that Peregrinus would go up riding on the fire (ὀχούμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός). Is Lucian referring to Neoplatonic ὄχημα,[108] introducing yet another stage metaphor, or merely using a pompous expression for 'borne on the flames'?[109] He himself provides the clue. He uses ὀχοῦμαι or ἐποχοῦμαι of any ridiculous ride aloft: the fly mounting his mate—in a mock-heroic context; Comedy riding on anapaests, or the tragic actor perched on his buskins;[110] the pompous fop Lexiphanes astride a donkey; or Socrates airborne by means of a magic ring.[111] This detail belongs to Lucian's normal language of caricature.

Peregrinus' famous last words are more difficult. Lucian reports that the vulture leaves the pyre with the cry ἔλιπον γᾶν, βαίνω δ' ἐς Ὄλυμπον. Now a θεῖος ἀνήρ can expect some farewell gesture of this kind: Apollonius of Tyana is hailed by an invisible chorus with the cry στεῖχε γᾶς, στεῖχε ἐς οὐρανόν, στεῖχε,[112] and Alexander of Abonoteichos promises to go out in a blaze of glory, struck by a thunderbolt.[113] But there is plenty of room for classical allusion here as well,[114] and Lucian's usual sources easily converge (the

---

[103] *Merc. Cond.* 33; *Icar.* 10/*Pax* 73 ff.
[104] *Icar.* 22, *Deor. Conc.* 8.
[105] Cf. *Peregr.* 27.
[106] *Icar.* 22.
[107] *Anth. Pal.* VII.62.
[108] R. Pack, *AJPh* 67 (1946), 334-45.
[109] M. Kokolakis, ΠΛΑΤΩΝ 12 (1960), 42.
[110] *Musc. Enc.* 6; *Prom. es* 6; *Salt.* 27.
[111] *Navig.* 45.
[112] Philostratus *l.c.*
[113] *Alex.* 40.
[114] Out of numerous examples collected by R. Holland, *ARW* 23 (1925), 207-220.

eagle in Penelope's dream, Herodotus' story of Aristeas, the phantom souls in the *Phaedo*, and Trygaeus' dung-beetle).[115]

There are other difficulties.[116] It is not clear where Peregrinus thought he was going. Why does he call to his father and mother, when they are not in heaven but in the lower world?[117] But the purpose of this detail is to prepare for a malicious reminder of Peregrinus' patricide (37); it may also imply that Peregrinus is now claiming divine parentage as well—and certainly Lucian attributes such claims explicitly to Alexander of Abonoteichos.[118] Again, Peregrinus also expects to mingle with the ether (33). This too could imply a life in the underworld; but the ghosts in the Islands of the Blest have no substance either, and Empedocles and the Moonmen also fade into thin air;[119] so that as far as Lucian is concerned Peregrinus' aspirations can still be skywards. And he despatches Messengers and Runners of the dead (νεκραγγέλλοι, νερτεροδρόμοι 41); these should certainly be from the underworld, but in Lucian dead men send messages from the Islands of the Blest as well as from Hades,[120] and the theme of comic messengers can occur in any context.[121]

All these details, then, are unreliable pointers to Peregrinus' religious motives: and if we take into account other details which might have a bearing on the scene, the result is total confusion—all of it paralleled elsewhere in Lucian.

Peregrinus is compared to Heracles: but so are the dubious friends of Lucian's bookcollector.[122] He is the new Socrates, or imitates the Brahmans, like the student in *Toxaris*.[123] And he adopts a more pretentious name, like the upstart Simon in *Gallus*.[124]

---

[115] *Od.* XIX.538 ff.; Herod. IV.15; Ar. *Pax.* 154; Pl. *Phaedo* 81CD.

[116] Various efforts have been made to find a suitable metre for Peregrinus' utterance ἔλιπον γᾶν κ.τ.λ., and Glyconic, Ionic and Anapaestic solutions have all been suggested. The most appropriate is that of Crusius (*Ph.* 54, 1895, 576), an *exodos* anapaest. Two hints from Lucian can be cited to confirm it: he boasts ἐτραγῴδουν τι παρ' ἐμαυτοῦ, which points to paratragedy (39); and since Comedy herself can be ἀναπαίστοις μέτροις ἐποχουμένη (*Prom. es* 6), it would be no surprise for Lucian to supply an anapaest for Peregrinus' celestial journey.

[117] *ARW l.c.* 210.

[118] *Alex.* 40.

[119] *VH* II.12; *id.* I.23; *Icar.* 14.

[120] *VH* II.29; *D. Mort.* I.1.

[121] *Supra* 50.

[122] *Peregr.* 4/*Adv. Ind.* 23.

[123] *Tox.* 34.

[124] *Gall.* 14. See *infra* 86.

He has also the usual bag of tricks: he will pass himself off as a nocturnal spirit: in *Icar.* Empedocles is mistaken for a lunar daimon, while in *Gall.* the transmigrated Pythagoras acts as a spy in the night.[125] The moon herself is a witness to Peregrinus' exhibition, just as she spies on all other philosophers in *Icar.*[126] And he is proclaimed by an oracle—a familiar source of *jeu d'esprit* in Lucian.[127] There are also some well-worn satirical themes. The villain has his bluff called and tries to put off his doom: Lucian's victims frequently try to prevaricate.[128] There are two 'eyewitness' accounts of his ascent, both of them false, like the eyewitness accounts of lying historians (*Hist.* 29).[129] And Peregrinus' cure for his eyesight has a suspicious ring in an author so interested in blindness and clear sight.[130]

Such a list throws even less light on the person of Peregrinus. It simply shows what we should expect when Lucian tries to include as many different sources of fun as he can. In his other descriptions of ritual he sets out to be equally comprehensive;[131] and he is also interested in immolation—whether the victim is Semele, Empedocles, Heracles, or Asclepius;[132] this is his opportunity to talk at length on the subject.

On the other hand it would be surprising in the context of second century religion if Peregrinus had *not* practised some degree of syncretism:[133] but we can scarcely expect to account for why he should change from imitating Brahmans greeting the rising sun (39) to performing a lunar ritual (36) *at a day's notice*: did Lucian insert the first alternative merely for the sake of including it? Or could Peregrinus, with only one chance of committing suicide, genuinely not make up his mind which way to go about it? Again, if Peregrinus' motive was really based on Indian lore, why are we told that he faced south before leaping on the pyre (36)—when Lucian seems under the impression that the Brahmans face East (cf. 39)? Did he draw his information on India from a source which had

---

125 *Icar.* 13, *Gall.* 28.

126 *Icar.* 21.

127 *Peregr.* 29.

128 33, 35/Zeus, *J. Trag.* 12, 42; *Icar.* 33; *Timon* 10; Toxaris, *Tox.* 9.

129 39 f. (cf. also *Icar. passim*).

130 45/cf. *Nigr.* 4.

131 *Philops.* 14, *Neky.* 7 ff., *D. Meretr.* 4.4 f.

132 *D. Deor.* 9.2; *Icar.* 13; *D. Deor.* 13.

133 Alexander openly did. For Neo-Pythagorean syncretism see H. M. Hornsby, *Hermathena* 23 (1933), 65-84, and bibl. there cited.

nothing to do with Peregrinus (Onesicritus, 25)? Is Peregrinus himself being unduly whimsical about this kind of detail? Or is Lucian himself adding more embellishment at random about compass-directions? (He makes up an answer to the fool who asks whether the vulture flies east or west).

It is impossible to tell where Lucian ends and Peregrinus begins, but the rest of the work is too artificial to inspire confidence. Lucian's meeting with Theagenes (3-31) seems particularly suspect: he just happens to be passing in time to hear a street-corner Cynic ranting, as Pan or Zeus hears the philosophers' hubbub; and Theagenes comes very close to his account of his own battle with 'Atimarchus' in *Pseudologista*.[134] And we are told that he left Theagenes ranting because the Hellenodikai were already in the Plethrion (31). Very probably: but Lucian walks out of a fictitious conversation in disgust in *Philopseudes*, and uses Hellenodikai as an 'antique' touch elsewhere whenever he pleases.[135]

So much then for Lucian's eyewitness reporting. Even within the traditions of historical anecdote, however, he has room for a good deal of freedom. It is fairly safe to suspect his hand at work in the story of Anacharsis at *Scytha* 3-8. Elsewhere he handles his Scythian with considerable independence:[136] and here we find him linked with a patently fictitious Toxaris.[137] The latter finds his fellow-countryman lost in an unlikely spot (the middle of Athens), and comes to the rescue with a quick way to see the sights (by introducing him to Solon). This is little more than a doublet of the dramatic scene in *Charon* 1 ff.: Hermes finds his old companion Charon lost in an equally unexpected place (above ground), and also finds a quick way to show him the sights of this new world (4-7). Here we find Solon introduced *ex machina*, like Philosophy herself in *Piscator*, and in almost the same words.[138] In the absence of other evidence it seems likely that Lucian simply invented a companion for Anacharsis, and varied a characteristic formula to

---

[134] *Bis Acc.* 11; *J. Trag.* 16; *Timon* 9; for 'Atimarchus', *Pseudolog.* 5 ff.

[135] *Philops.* 39. For Hellenodikai, *Herm.* 39 ff.; *pro Imag.* 11. For this kind of decoration, E. Bowie, *Past and Present* 46 (1970), 1-41 *passim*.

[136] *Infra* 82.

[137] For the name, *supra* 34.

[138] *Scytha* 6: μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ δαίμονα οὗτος αὐτὸς ἡμῖν πρόσεισιν, ὁ ἐπὶ συννοίας, ὁ λαλῶν ἑαυτῷ / *Pisc.* 13: μᾶλλον δὲ ἤδη πρόσεισιν. ὁρᾷς . . . τὴν ἐπὶ συννοίας ἠρέμα βαδίζουσαν;

suit the occasion—he himself is a stranger lecturing before the most influential patron.[139]

Lucian may well have added something of his own to the 'historical' exempla at *Icar.* 15: Menippus has been spying on a number of Hellenistic court intrigues: then in another quarter he sees (a) Arsakes killing the effeminate pansy (τὸ γύναιον) and the eunuch Arbakes drawing his sword on Arsakes; and (b) Spatinus the Mede in the hands of the guards, being dragged by the feet from the dining-hall, with his head smashed by a golden cup. The nearest approaches to this are the two versions of Sardanapalus' death preserved in Diodorus II.24-28 and Athenaeus 528F f.;[140] both compilers owe something to Ctesias, whose work Lucian himself certainly knew.[141] They agree that a Median general Arbakes gains access to Sardanapalus through a eunuch; Athenaeus adds that in one frequent variant the intruder kills the king on the spot.[142] Lucian's episode could easily be a reference to this event,[143] but with Arbakes now the eunuch and a certain Arsakes as the general; elsewhere he casts Arsakes as a Median governor and military commander,[144] obviously as a stock 'oriental' name. It appears in Ctesias [145] as the original name of Artaxerxes, and the context is significant: just before an abortive coup by a eunuch Artoxares who uses a false beard.[146] This is just the kind of passage which is liable to interest Lucian: it would be a most obvious scene to conflate with the death of Sardanapalus, and it would be easy for Lucian to 'absorb' the name Arsakes as he did so. So much then for Arsakes and the γύναιον. What about the hapless Spatinus? Lucian's other 'scene' (b) has a detail in common with Diodorus, who mentions the golden cup which serves as the eunuch's reward for granting access to the king.[147] Now in Lucian a golden cup is

[139] For the formula, *infra* 109 ff.

[140] = Jacoby *FGH* IIIc 688 fgt. 1p, q.

[141] *VH* I.3.

[142] We are not concerned with the version where Sardanapalus commits suicide, which Athenaeus attributes specifically to Ctesias (629B).

[143] In Lucian's version there is no difficulty about taking τὸ γύναιον as Sardanapalus himself ('A. killing the pansy', as against 'A. der sein Weib tötet', Helm *LM* 98): Lucian employs him as the proverbial effeminate (*D. Mort.* 2.1, *J. Conf.* 16).

[144] *D. Mort.* 27.2 f.

[145] Photius *Cod.* 72.43a.

[146] For eunuchs at court, *Merc. Cond.* 29; L. is particularly fond of jokes about beards, e.g. *J. Trag.* 16; *Eun.* 9; cf. *Bis Acc.* 11, *Philops.* 5.

[147] II.24.

used to hit Spatinus: are we to infer that the eunuch has already received the cup, attacks Spatinus (the king's last defence, or some favourite?), and is now turning on the intruder?

Diodorus and Athenaeus offer no further help, and the latter implies that there were a number of 'authorities' for the whole incident. This leaves us with three possibilities: Lucian could have drawn on one of the lost accounts;[148] he could have garbled several versions irretrievably, after his usual careless fashion;[149] or he could be improvising some rhetorical fabrication of his own.[150]

There are parallels for all three procedures in his practice elsewhere: at *Charon* 13 he reports another chain of historical murders viewed from a vantage-point (Croesus-Cyrus-Tomyris).[151] But he can be careless enough to confuse Thersippus and Pheidippides, or transpose Cleobis and Biton and Tellus of Athens;[152] or he can tamper with Herodotus' story of Maeandrius, enhancing his downfall to point a moral.[153] But he can just as easily piece together a historical drama of his own: in *Katapl.* 8ff. Megapenthes takes over from Cydimachus, commandeers Cleocritus' golden bowls, is poisoned at dinner, and is succeeded by another tyrant (Megacles?).[154] Moreover brawls at dinner are a favourite theme: philosophers crack one another's skulls with goblets, or a soldier drags his opponent from a courtesan's party by the hair.[155] If Lucian made up this incident, there is something to be said for separating the two scenes (a) and (b): he concocts incidents at *Gall.* 25, and the arrangements there are significantly parallel: again a cluster of historical allusions, followed by a few less specific events which are patently fictitious; while in *D. Mort.* 27.3 Arsakes appears once more, and again meets his death—and Lucian places him next to a story about golden vessels (27.2) which is clearly unrelated. In *Icar.* a fictitious incident with historical 'decoration' would serve

---

148 529A.

149 Walz, *Geschichtlichen Kenntnisse o.c.* 19-26, Helm 98.

150 As Walz (33 f.) and Helm (98) concede. But neither offers convincing grounds: Helm still wants to leave room for imitation of Menippus; Walz rightly compares *Gall.* 25, but forgets that she elsewhere commits herself (64) to taking Ctesias as Lucian's source, although in his version Sardanapalus committed suicide!

151 *Herod.* I.86; I.214.

152 *pro Lapsu* 3; *Charon* 10.

153 *Charon* 14 (Walz *o.c.* 46).

154 *Katapl.* 8-13.

155 *Conv.* 43 ff., cf. *Herm.* 11 f.; *D. Meretr.* 15.1.

to link the historical incidents of c. 15 with the fictitious philosophers in the next chapter.

On the whole the evidence points to considerable tampering on Lucian's part: I suspect that he did know at least *some* vague historical outline; but that he contaminated the name Arsakes into the proceedings from a separate passage of Ctesias, and associated it either by accident or design with the eunuch's coup which follows. He had only to transplant the name to a similar context, and give the eunuch who betrays Sardanapalus an extra murder to complicate the incident. He is fond of juxtaposing exotic names of similar sound, hence Arbakes-Arsakes; he also wanted to find an additional use for the bowl, and so introduced Spatinus simply to be hit by it. This is precisely what he does in two other drinking-parties:[156] the bridegroom Chaereas and the Peripatetic Euthydemus have no other function than to be struck by flying tableware; and the name Spatinus itself seems an obvious coinage for a favourite (cf. σπατάλη). There is plenty of room for other possibilities: all that Lucian needs is the most vaguely 'oriental' court-intrigue to replace the Hellenistic ones he has just been describing. Whether he adheres precisely to a story or not, he had more than sufficient means to invent this kind of episode.

He may have exercised his powers of invention just as readily in *Historia* itself: although he claims to be quoting extensively from contemporary historians of the Parthian War, his 'extracts' need to be examined in the same way. He declares that he was a frequent listener, and promises to recite what he remembers hearing recently in Ionia and only the other day in Achaea.[157] But the fact that he was in Ionia is no proof that he really heard these historians, or that these were the histories he did hear if he did attend recitations. Lucian can use a detail such as ἥκω σοι . . . ἀκούσας to corroborate the most absurd situations.[158] And he seems to protest too much about the truth of what his audience is about to hear, when he requests them by the Graces not to disbelieve what he is going to say![159] In *Toxaris* the Greek and Scythian storytellers make equally elaborate protestations as they vie to outdo each others' lies!

Lucian 'quotes' a casualty-list for the battle of Europus, but it

---

[156] *Conv.* 44; *Herm.* 12.
[157] *Hist.* 14, cf. 7.
[158] *Philops.* 5.
[159] *Hist.* 14.

shows the same degree of exaggeration as the fantastic levies in *Verae Historiae*;[160] while the romantic digression on the adventures of Mausacus reads like a trivial burlesque of Toxaris' third tale.[161] Afranius Silo's *epitaphios* in honour of Severianus has been compared to Peregrinus' farewell speech before his suicide;[162] and there are two still closer parallels: the lackey Afranius is pronouncing on his master's suicide, as Theagenes does on behalf of Peregrinus; and he is an amateur rhetor trying to defend a charlatan, like 'Atimarchus' delivering his pathetic declamation on behalf of Pythagoras.[163] Severianus himself cuts his throat with expensive crystal drinking cups: the whole episode savours of the extravagant *Scheintod* episodes in the novel; and Lucian himself is always interested in any unusual kinds of death.[164] Drinking-cups are one of the stock symbols of luxury;[165] while in *VH* he turns various unlikely objects into weapons of war: a mullet-rib serves as a sword, roses as chains, or asparagus as spears; and glass itself is used for luxury clothing on the moon:[166] he has therefore all the ingredients for a bizarre episode of this kind. One of the armchair historians describes how the Parthians mounted live serpents on poles to terrify the Romans: but digressions on serpents are a frequent interest of Lucian's,[167] and so are surprise attacks with secret weapons.[168] The historians commit their final outrage by introducing prophecy and founding fictitious cities. These are the very abuses which Lucian reserves for the climaxes of his chief attacks on superstition in *Philopseudes* and *Alexander*: Eucrates' discussion of oracles drives him away from the philosophers' discussion,[169] and Alexander's final act of effrontery is to found Ionopolis in his own memory.[170] Moreover Lucian himself can be inventive in this sphere: Nicaea and Homonoia are little different from the fictitious communities in *VH*. One of

---

160 *Hist.* 20/*VH* I.13 ff.

161 *Hist.* 28/*Tox.* 44-55.

162 *Hist.* 26/*Peregr.* 32 ff. (Homeyer, *Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, Munich 1965 *ad loc.*).

163 *Peregr.* 3 ff.; *Pseudolog.* 5 ff.

164 *Hist.* 25/*Tyrann.* 21 f.; *Phalaris* I.11 f.; *D. Mort.* 27; *Peregr.*

165 *Tox.* 46; *Navig.* 20; *Gall.* 11, *Katapl.* 16.

166 I.37, II.6; I.16; I.25.

167 *Hist.* 29/*Dips.*; *Philops.* 11 f.; *Alex.* 7.

168 *Bacch.* 4; *Anach.* 31 ff.; *Zeuxis* 9 f.; cf. *VH* I.18.

169 *Hist.* 31/*Philops.* 38 f.

170 *Ibid.*/*Alex.* 58. For the broader issue of the historians' identity, see *infra* 77 ff.

Lucian's liars promises to write about events beyond the outer sea: but his own last fling in *VH* is to make this same promise—in the first person! and in *Philopseudes* he breaks off the narrative just as Eucrates is about to launch into still more nonsense about Pergamum and Patara.[171]

Whether the historians are authentic or not,[172] it is clear that Lucian has selected details which coincide closely with his interests in other fields. The same applies to the two 'historical' exempla which introduce the work. The people of Abdera are struck by a plague of tragic acting. This type of story is frequently found in paradoxographic writing: the inhabitants of Ipola in Baetica take to their heels when they first see a tragic actor; all the women of Miletus want to hang themselves; a plague of philosophy and geometry strikes Syracuse under Dionysius; and plagues of garrulity, orators' reminiscences and litigation all appear as comic diseases.[173] Lucian's story contains two elements quoted separately by Aelian:[174] a plague of ecstasy sweeps over Greece, and the Sybarites come to blows over a harpist; here a tragic actor sends the city into frenzy. Such cases suggest that Lucian was working once more with a flexible theme rather than a fixed version. Apart from the inevitable allusion to Thucydides' Plague, he is always interested in the actor's madness or infectious enthusiasm:[175] Menippus comes back from the underworld infected with an overdose of Euripides; Dionysus' mad rout sweeps through India; an Indian fountain causes an annual fit of talking;[176] and *J. Trag.* opens with a dramatic version, where Athene and Hermes join Zeus in his infectious tragic acting.

I know of no direct parallel for the second story (*Historia* 3): Diogenes has nothing to do at the siege of Corinth, and rolls his jar over the Kraneion as his contribution to the war effort! This has all the characteristics of a traditional apophthegm:[177] the nearest parallel is perhaps Maximus of Tyre's account of Diogenes' private truce. And Lucian would certainly have known the famous anecdote

---

171 31/*VH* II.47; *Philops.* 38.

172 See *infra* 77 ff.

173 *Hist.* 1/*Philostr.* VA V.29; Plut. *Mor.* 249B; id. 52D; id. 502CD, 513E, 501F.

174 *VH* III.42, 43.

175 *Salt.* 83; *Nigr.* 1 and 38 (Homeyer).

176 *Neky.* 1; *Bacch.* 3; *id.* 7.

177 Homeyer *ad loc.*

which connects Diogenes the ἐπίσκοπος with Philip's camp.[178] But he writes several comic variations on the philosophers' strange behaviour in battle—including Socrates encouraging Diogenes![179] Here he has only to give the latter his usual attributes—independence and the jar—and add an 'authentic' time and place: he may have needed no other model.

If Lucian can put together fictitious anecdotes complete with corroborative details, he can extend the technique to a whole dialogue. In the *Eunuchus* the conversation concerns two eminent philosophers competing for a chair; one is a eunuch, and the issue depends on whether such a person is suitable. Someone reminds the assessors that the 'eunuch' only acquired this reputation to escape a charge of adultery, and the case is referred to Rome. It is natural to assume that this is a real event; apart from the fictitious names Diocles and Bagoas, Lucian's account is usually allowed to stand.[180] The dramatic date looks authentic—after Marcus Aurelius endowed chairs in 176;[181] but again Lucian is an expert with corroborative detail, and when he tells us that he has just come with an eyewitness report from the Agora it is no proof that the event took place:[182] he uses similar formulae in *Philops.* or *Conv.*, where the situations are quite clearly fictitious.[183]

Again there is a long anecdote tradition behind this sort of incident. Archidamus exposed a Chian ambassador before the Spartan assembly for dyeing his hair;[184] Philostratus mentions a eunuch caught in adultery,[185] Epictetus a scholar:[186] Lucian's Bagoas is both. And the whole subject as he presents it has the flavour of a school theme ('the court debates whether Bagoas should be disqualified from the chair as a eunuch, or admitted despite his former life as an adulterer!'). This would be reminiscent of the pseudologist's performance: 'Is Pythagoras to be admitted to the Mysteries as a Greek, or excluded because of his former life

---

[178] *Or.* XXXVI.5, 6H.

[179] *Pisc.* 1; cf. *Anach.* 31 ff.; *Symp.* 43 ff.; *VH* II.23.

[180] E.g. Hirzel II.215, cf. Bompaire 476; K. Funk, *Ph* Suppl. 10 (1907), 607 ff.

[181] Dio LXXII.31; Philostr. *VS* 566.

[182] *Contra* H. Richard, *Ueber die Lykinosdialoge des Lukian*, Progr. Hamburg 1886, 29.

[183] *Philops.* 5, cf. *Conv.* 1-7 *passim.*

[184] Aelian *VH* VI.20.

[185] *VA* I.36.

[186] *Diss.* II.iv.1.

as Euphorbus?'[187] All that Lucian needs by way of authenticity is a vacant Chair: after that his own embellishments are easily recognised. Much of the material is drawn from the standard repertoire of abuse against philosophy. The two competitors have prize-money as bait, like Lucian's victims in *Piscator*;[188] the philosopher's beard is inferior to a goat's;[189] Socrates is a seducer; and philosophers are to be inspected like slaves—the theme of *Vit. Auct.*[190] There is also some familiar embellishment on the subject of eunuchs. They are unusual hybrids, and so reflect Lucian's taste for curious combinations of creatures; and they are ill-omened sights, a remark which he also levelled against the pseudologist to his cost;[191] and of course he has to include the parallel of Favorinus, whom his teacher Demonax had ridiculed.[192]

But the action also contains a large number of 'Lucianic' motifs. Philosophers are competitors at funeral games, like the successors of Alexander of Abonoteichos.[193] They must have eminent judges: in *Piscator* Philosophy herself is appointed to head a similar enquiry.[194] The charge against Bagoas takes him unawares; Peregrinus is similarly caught out when pressed to commit suicide.[195] Everyone is amused when an anonymous stranger intervenes (of course Lucian himself, as in *Peregrinus*[196])—and he invites the tribunal to strip the pretender, as Cyniscus invites Rhadamanthus to examine the tyrant and adulterer Megapenthes.[197] The assembly makes suggestions about the fate of philosophers, as the gods do in *Icar.*: and an old judge is to stand over Bagoas as he 'performs'—a reminder of Hephaestus standing over Ares when he is caught in the act in *D. Deorum.*[198] As often in Lucian, the embarrassing decision is postponed, and we are left with philosophers on the eve of battle—like Timocles and Damis in *J. Trag.* 17.

The *Eunuchus*, then, amounts to a concentrated index of Lucian's

---

187 Cf. *Pseudolog.* 5.
188 *Eun.* 3/*Pisc.* 41 f.
189 *Eun.* 9/*passim*; for the beard, cf. *Bis Acc.* 11, *Dem.* 13.
190 *Eun.* 12.
191 *Eun.* 6/*Pseudolog.* 8.
192 *Eun.* 7/*Dem.* 12 f.
193 *Eun.* 4/*Alex.* 60, cf. *VH* II.22.
194 *Eun.* 2/*Pisc.* 9.
195 *Eun.* 7/*Peregr.* 33.
196 *Eun.* 10/*Peregr.* 7 (so Harmon *LCL* V.341; cf. also *Pseudolog.* 7).
197 *Katapl.* 23-26.
198 *Icar.* 33; *D. Deor.* 17.2.

situations; and since it was not written before 176, it is clear that he must have had a fully-formed repertoire from which to draw them. Nor need we be surprised at his apparent lack of taste: he has simply taken the opportunity to expand to the full his topos of the immoral philosopher caught red-handed. The whole *mise en scène* is simply an up-to-date version of *D. Deor.* 17: Hermes is delighted to tell Apollo that he was in the crowd to watch Hephaestus exposing Ares and Aphrodite; Lucian can relate a scandal between philosophers in a 'Platonic' frame, *Conv.* 3-4, 46; as an *adynaton* about Aeschines (*Apol.* 6-7); or in a New Comic setting (*D. Meretr.* 10): here once again he may only have needed to add corroborative date and place.

The tales so far discussed have given Lucian further opportunities to vary or develop material in his repertoire: and it is always tempting to suspect that he exercised considerable freedom in his collection of over fifty anecdotes about the life of the otherwise little-known philosopher Demonax. Did he follow the traditional methods of writing *apomnemoneumata*, and attach apophthegms indiscriminately to his master? It is far from certain that he did so on purpose, and Bompaire cites only three arguable cases.[199] But there is no doubt that many of the anecdotes do reflect Lucian's own interests: a well serves as a mirror;[200] when goods can be bought, then money is a sorcerer;[201] a god can only hear prayers from a special place;[202] barbarians are excluded from the mys-

[199] Bompaire 514. At *Dem.* 51 Demonax protests against the introduction of gladiatorial games at Athens to rival those at Corinth: Philostratus attributes the same action to Apollonius of Tyana (*VA* IV.22), Dio of Prusa (*Or.* XXXI.121 f.) to Musonius. But the case is still indecisive: all three men might well have been involved in condemning the games at some stage. Funk conceded that Lucian may have made a slip here (*Ph* Suppl. 10, 1907, 652 f.); and it would be easy enough to parallel from his own practice elsewhere (cf. *supra* 58). Bompaire (453 n. 3) suspects Demonax' consolation to a bereaved father ('find three men who have not mourned', 25). If this banal *bon mot* requires a pedigree, there is a still simpler version attributed to Epictetus (*Diss.* I.27.9: 'name me a country where no-one has died!). (On a superfluous Indian parallel see Bompaire *ibid.*). But the Emperor Julian cites Lucian's version, this time attributed to Democritus (*Ep.* 69, 413A). Again this is indecisive in itself: Julian could easily have referred such an apophthegm to the more august 'authority'; and it would in any case be easy for the story to pass from Demonax to Democritus. And there would be nothing to prevent Demonax from quoting traditional apophthegms without acknowledgement.

[200] *Dem.* 22/*VH* I.26.

[201] 23/*Philops.* 15.

[202] 27/*Icar.* 25.

teries;[203] or a man comes back from Hades.[204] At first sight it is tempting to accept that Lucian *did* transfer material into *Demonax.* But the quality of the anecdotes themselves is decisively against it. If he had wished to display his virtuosity in writing an encomium on his master, or in telling humorous tales, he could have done much better than this: but the versions here are uniformly brief and banal. There is no room for the profusion of subsidiary detail so characteristic of Lucian elsewhere, or the compulsive combination of themes; and any parallels within his work are invariably more cleverly developed than the versions attributed to Demonax. One might argue that he conforms to the 'appropriate' genre and adopts the artifice proper to it; but he had nothing to gain by so doing, when it gave him no opportunity for display on his own account.

Many of the anecdotes which Lucian has collected are more than traditional *bons mots*: they reflect the everyday gossip of sophistic circles. Herodes Atticus' grief was still a subject of current affairs;[205] Demonax' attack on Favorinus concurs to some extent with Philostratus' remarks;[206] and a fair proportion of the anecdotes whose authenticity has gone unquestioned belong to the same milieu as the *Vitae Sophistarum.*[207] Since Lucian is usually so sparing with contemporary references elsewhere—even in the most explicit pamphlets—this kind of information is all the more conspicuous: he has simply not attempted to apply his usual artifice.

The only reasonable solution is to take the work at its face value: Lucian recorded the apophthegms out of genuine piety towards his teacher rather than artistic satisfaction—hence the exceptional glimpses of a genuine second-century milieu. On present evidence we have no real reason to doubt that Demonax was one of the formative influences in Lucian's repertoire: he certainly

---

[203] 34/*Pseudolog.* 5.

[204] 43/*D. Mort.* 1. For other parallels see A. Schwartz, *Zeitschr. f. öster. Gymn.* 29 (1878), 573 n. 2; K. Funk *o.c.* 607-13.

[205] *Dem.* 24, 33/Philostr. *VS* 556-559.

[206] *Dem.* 12, 13/*VS* 489 (although Bompaire may have doubts about Favorinus' reputation as a eunuch, 476).

[207] Funk *o.c.* 651 n. 249 notes a number of coincidences with Philostratus' account of Polemo (*VS* 530 ff.). In addition he condemns Peregrinus (*Dem.* 21), as Herodes does (*VS* 563); and the orator who practises to himself (*Dem.* 36, cf. Marcus of Byzantium *VS* 529).

did not assign the material to this source for the sake of literary variation.

The *Demonax*, then, is an exception. Otherwise Lucian's anecdotes still exhibit a wide range of treatment: he is capable of using the most perfunctory school exempla without alteration, or constructing a complex pastiche and including a mass of detail for its own sake; and there are a host of possibilities still open for the anecdotes which lie between these extremes. It is impossible to be precise about Lucian's invention; but there can be no doubt about his technique and tastes—or how constantly his anecdotes overlap with each other—or with his usual interests elsewhere.

CHAPTER FOUR

CHARACTERISATION

Lucian manipulates his characters as easily as he contrives his stories or plots; here again he is content to play a facile game with a few basic types. He may use the same character under several different names, so that there is often little distinction between Cyniscus, Diogenes and Menippus,[1] between Diogenes and Socrates,[2] or between Croesus and Megapenthes.[3] Nor does he always present the same character in a consistent way: in one dialogue the poor cobbler Micyllus is miserable all his life, until released by death; in another he is only miserable till he discovers that the poor man's life is best.[4] Even Menippus himself varies according to the genre: Lucian makes him a humane gentleman in the Platonic dialogues, but a vindictive brute in the Cynic sketches.[5] He treats his female personifications as interchangeable,[6] and contaminates traditional types till they have no real consistency:[7] and he will conflate the philosopher and the parasite,[8] the tyrant and the rich man,[9] or even Socrates and Plato.[10] All this has its consequences, whether he is dealing with second-century society or traditional literary figures. We can expect neither depth nor consistency, and we have to see any one character in terms of what he is doing elsewhere.

It is always tempting to regard his rhetorician and philosopher as two distinct targets for satire,[11] and the two groups still liked to see themselves in opposite camps in the second century. But

[1] Cf. Bompaire 183.
[2] Bompaire 186.
[3] Hirzel II.324.
[4] *Katapl.* 15/*Gall.* 33.
[5] *Icar.*, *Neky.*/*D. Mort.* 10.
[6] Culture, *Somn.* 6/Philosophy, *Pisc.* 13/Hope, *Merc. Cond.* 42/Rhetoric, *Rh. Pr.* 6 (Bompaire 350); Rhetoric, *Bis Acc.* 31/False Philosophy, *Pisc.* 12 (Helm *LM* 295).
[7] Bompaire 220, 221 and n. 1; 217.
[8] *Ibid.* 207 n. 1.
[9] *Katapl.* 8; 14.
[10] *Vit. Auct.* 15-18.
[11] Bompaire 489.

Lucian is content to assimilate them as far as possible: the rhetor of *Rhetorum Praeceptor* has his ignorance, audacity, shamelessness, shouting and singing, ostentatious walk and preoccupation with his appearance [12]—all inevitable attributes for Lucian's philosophers; he too relies for jargon on a handful of impressive words; [13] both types disregard the established models,[14] and yet command blind admiration;[15] their teachers demand infinite labour; [16] and in the end the pupil must take the blame for choosing so miserable a career.[17] Lucian uses the same flourish to introduce both types: they masquerade as supermen, and the bogus rhetor can be a strange phantom nourished on dew,[18] like the philosopher Empedocles, or outdo Otus and Ephialtes, like Menippus; [19] and Lucian inevitably adds that he cannot do justice to either rhetor or philosopher without disgracing his part.[20] When his own approach is so facile, we are reminded that he usually prefers exhaustiveness to authenticity.

This makes it all the more difficult to disentangle the individual from the type, especially when he is attacking contemporaries.[21] Candidates have been supplied in plenty to fit the 'namesake of the sons of Zeus and Leda' (τοῖς Διὸς καὶ Λήδας παισὶν ὁμώνυμος [22]) at *Rh. Pr.* 24, or the hyperattic pedant Lexiphanes.[23] Lucian may be attacking a type in *Lexiphanes*, but an individual in *Rh. Pr.*,[24] or the same individual in both; [25] or he may even have been determined to conflate a real and recognisable figure (probably Pollux)

---

[12] *Rh. Pr.* 15.
[13] *Rh. Pr.* 16/*Gall.* 11, *Timon* 9, *Conv.* 23, *Pisc.* 35.
[14] *Rh. Pr.* 17/*Pisc.* 32.
[15] *Rh. Pr.* 20/*Conv.* 7, *Philops.* 29, *Herm.* 16.
[16] 9/*Herm.* 48-50.
[17] 26/*Merc. Cond.* 42.
[18] 11/*Icar.* 13.
[19] 13/*Icar.* 23.
[20] 12/*Nigr.* 11.
[21] For the problem of Lucian's 'pseudo-actualité' as a whole, see Bompaire 471-538.
[22] Pollux, as suggested by the scholia, and developed by C. F. Ranke, *Pollux et Lucianus*, Quedlinberg 1831; or an unknown Dioscorides, (Th. Sinko, *Eos* 14, 1908, 133); a Didymus or Geminus would be equally possible (Harmon, *LCL* IV.133).
[23] Herodian (Ranke *o.c.* 27); Pollux (H. Richard, *Ueber die Lykinosdialoge des Lukian*, Progr. Hamburg 1886, 48); Phrynichus (Schmid-Christ II.ii.[6] 698, recanted in II.ii.[6] 729).
[24] Croiset 78, 258.
[25] Richard *o.c.* 47 f.

with traits which obviously did not fit, taking the same liberties as Aristophanes was accused of taking with the historical Socrates (Pl. *Apol.* 19C).[26]

None of these theories is likely to do much violence to the few facts available, and one could go on adding candidates: Antiochus despised Alexander Peloplaton for his luxuriant language, and this charge would fit Lexiphanes.[27] But some measure of coincidence is to be expected between *any* two of Lucian's enemies: to qualify one has only to be popular or influential, preferably with some oriental connexions! We must be content to suspect that he has assimilated these portraits just like any others.

There are copious cross-references between *Rhetorum Praeceptor, Lexiphanes,* and *Pseudologista,* and they immediately blur the identification. All three victims are immoral: the *pseudologista* is accused outright of gross indecency; Lucian only hints at the same charges against the *rhetorum praeceptor,* when he advises the pupil to acquire a reputation without necessarily indulging; [28] while Lexiphanes' composition is full of effeminate *double entendre.* All three are condemned for extravagant archaism, neologism and solecism,[29] as well as for drawing on the *meletai* of the preceding generation; [30] and two if not three are Orientals.[31] If Lucian had not implied quite clearly that the *rhetorum praeceptor* was an Egyptian but that the *pseudologist* was a Syrian,[32] it might have been all too easy to assume that they were the same person. Since we happen to know that they are not, we cannot risk identifying Lexiphanes with either of them. All we can safely say is that the three works were written for widely different motives: the *Pseudologista* is a defence of Lucian, tied to a specific occasion and concerned with the single word *apophras*; the other two pieces, in very different ways, have a much more

[26] Hall 216. Schwartz insists on seeing Herodes Atticus somewhere in the caricature as well, *Biographie* 121.

[27] Philostratus *VS* 574.

[28] *Pseudolog.* 25 f./*Rh. Pr.* 23.

[29] *Rh. Pr.* 17; *Pseudolog.* 24, 29; *Lex. passim* (archaism and neologism); 24 f. (solecism).

[30] *Rh. Pr.* 17/*Pseudolog.* 6/*Lex.* 23.

[31] The Lexiphanes may be a μέτοικος at Athens, cf. οὐδὲ μετοικικὰ τῆς Ἀθηναίων φωνῆς *Lex.* 25 (M. D. Macleod, *CQ N.S.* 6, 1956, 109).

[32] The *Pseudolog.* is a Tyrian (*Pseudolog.* 19); the *Rh. Pr.*'s father may have been a slave in Egypt (*Rh. Pr.* 24); there is nothing to suggest that he had subsequently moved.

literary purpose. *Rhetorum Praeceptor* is an updated Allegory of Prodicus, *Lexiphanes* an ingenious blend of Comic and Platonic material with a riotous parody of outlandish diction. The charges which unite the works are included as rather perfunctory diversions to all this. It is true that one of the lists of ostracised words in *Lex.* is very similar to that in *Rh. Pr.*, but this could easily reflect Lucian's usual technique of repeating stereotyped purple passages of abuse against various categories of philosophers.[33] When he is content to label all his rhetoricians as parasites, thieves, and libertines, then it is no surprise if he taints them all with a touch of Ulpianism as well. The decisive evidence is his portrait of Cantharus in *Fugitivi*. This *éminence grise* appears to have written τραγικοὶ διαλόγοι (33), and is a notorious plagiarist.[34] He elopes with his host's wife; and Lucian finds room at his expense for a pun on Theopompus' *Trikaranos*, as he does in his attack on the pseudologist.[35] Cantharus, then, could easily be another in the series of upstart sophists; but this time we know that he is a philosopher from Paphlagonia instead. Once more Lucian assimilates his victims and allows them to overlap in the interest of completeness.

As for the allusion to τοῖς Διὸς καὶ Λήδας παισὶν ὁμώνυμος (*Rh. Pr.* 24), there can be no doubt that Lucian's audience could have translated this into Pollux: but this takes us no nearer exact identification: the two specific details Lucian gives may be no more than the standard features for upstarts: he comes from an obscure background, above Xoïs and Thmuis; Alexander and Cantharus both come from equally humble origins in Paphlagonia; and Potheinus changes his name, like Simon-Simonides in Gallus, or Pyrrhias-Megacles, Dromo-Megabyzus and Tibeius-Protarchus in Timon.[36] But the obvious ambiguity between Pollux and Dioscorides might easily be intentional: Lucian several times found himself writing palinodes, and in every case he has covered himself

[33] Compare the prefabricated lists at *Rh. Pr.* 16 (ἄττα, κᾆτα, μῶν, ἀμηγέπη, λῷστε) and *Lex.* 21 (the same plus ἦδ' ὅς, δήπουθεν) with the lists of philosophers' technical terms (*Gall.* 11/*Herm.* 81; *Bis Acc.* 11/*Timon* 9).

[34] As shown by Lucian's alteration of λιγύς περ ἐὼν ἀγορητής (*Il.* II. 246) to κακῶν πανάριστε κολοιῶν in the pastiche of Homer (30).

[35] 32/*Pseudolog.* 29. He suggests that the three adulterers here are triphallic; the *Pseudologist* calls the *Trikaranos* a τριγλώχις λόγος. I suspect there may be some reference to Cantharus' frigid language in *Fugit.* also.

[36] *Alex.* 11, *Fugit.* 27 f. (origins); *Gall.* 14, *Tim.* 22 (change of name). Both traits go back to Theophrastus *Car.* XXVIII.

with a specious excuse: he did not actually sell philosophers, but their life-styles; he did not compare Panthea to goddesses, but to their statues; nor did he criticize public as opposed to private service with Romans.[37] In this case too it might have been in Lucian's interest to leave his victim rather vague:[38] all we can say is that he had to exert himself very little to mould his usual clichés into a caricature of Pollux[39] as Philostratus presents him; his other victims[40] are still more elusive.[41]

---

[37] *Vit. Auct.*, cf. *Pisc.* 32; *pro Imag.* 23; *Apol.* 11.

[38] Doubtless some of the clichés in *Navig.* 24 or *Icar.* 18 about extravagant public works and huge estates could easily have been taken to refer to Herodes Atticus, who had no shortage of enemies (cf. Philostr. *VS* 552, 574; and the discussion in J. Schwartz, *Biographie* 32, 121; Husson on *Navig.* 24). But this is not to say that Herodes was the exclusive or indeed the primary victim in any particular case. The same passage of *Navigium* would be an equally effective allusion to Damianus of Ephesus (*VS* 605).

[39] Two minor points in favour of Pollux: if Lucian wished to make up a scandalous nickname for him, he might have exercised his preference for an alliterative one, Potheinus, though this is of course obscured again when he paraphrased the real name. Also, the extracts of Pollux quoted by Philostratus (*VS* 593) cover ground of great interest to Lucian: Proteus' Metamorphoses (*D. Mar.* 4), in which he turns into a tree and sprouts foliage (cf. *VH* I.8, *supra* 27 f. and *VH* II.41); and a eunuch's letter from captivity.

[40] The most recent attempt to identify the Lexiphanes and Pseudologist is no more decisive. C. P. Jones (*GRBS* 13, 1972, 475-87) takes the *Lex.* to be Philagrus of Cilicia, on the grounds that Lucian has concealed his name in the words οἶσθα δὲ ὡς φίλαγρός εἰμι (*Lex.* 3). Unfortunately, he might just as easily have concealed the name of Alexander Peloplaton in *Lex.* 22 (τὸ δ' ἔνδοθεν πήλινος . . . ὤν). Jones fits the *Pseudolog.* much more convincingly to Adrian of Tyre. Two additional points in favour: Adrian did practise in Ephesus, *VS* 605, and he was liberal in his use of tragedy, which fits Lucian's abuse of the Pseudologist's career as an actor (19). But the most striking features of Philostratus' portrait can be fitted too easily elsewhere: Lucian and the audience laugh at his faked improvisation (5 ff.), just as Herodes' pupils humiliate Philagrus of Cilicia. This latter does not fit on geographical grounds (cf. *Pseudolog.* 19) as it happens. But when such an anecdote can be told of two sophists independently, it is very unrewarding to press these tentative identifications: for every sophist Philostratus sketches or Lucian attacks, how many similar arrogant plagiarists have disappeared without trace?

[41] Baldwin, *Studies o.c.* 36 ff. presses for a compliment to Galen in Lucian's doctor Sopolis, who heals the pedant in *Lexiphanes*. There is plenty of literary artifice here, whatever else there may be. The name Sopolis (= Sosipolis, 'save-city') need be no more than an 'occupational' name for a doctor (cf. Bompaire's lists, 699 f.). Lucian's interest in doctors and plagues was not confined to the epidemic under Marcus: compare the role of Toxaris as good doctor *ex machina*, *Scytha* 2; and even Empedocles with his cure for Menippus' eyesight, *Icar.* 14, or Dionicus arriving opportunely at the symposium, *Conv.* (For the literary role of doctors and medicine in general, Bompaire 433 f.). None of this excludes reference to an actual person as a surprise, as

The issues are more complex when Lucian is attacking religious figures. His two victims Peregrinus and Alexander are clearly identified, and the broad outlines of both these full-length portraits are certainly based on authentic religious experience in the second century.[42] But there is also room for embellishment on his own part: the θεῖος ἀνήρ is already a literary type,[43] and Lucian is well armed, as before, with the clichés of ancient invective.[44] But our picture is still far from complete. Is he primarily a religious rationalist who needed to be provoked by a cult in honour of Peregrinus, or by Alexander's oracle? [45] Or must he have a literary source, in this case an aretalogy? [46] We have still to relate these two works to each other and to the rest of Lucian. This has rarely been attempted: Helm connected *Peregrinus* mainly with *Fugitivi*, but cuts off Alexander altogether.[47] At least ten years separates the publication of the two pamphlets, but Lucian may have received his formative impression of both men at the same time in the 160s.[48] This makes it tempting for him to contaminate—or at least assimilate—his two *bêtes noires*.

The number of similarities is striking. Both of them have more notable namesakes, Proteus and Alexander the Great [49]—and a

---

in *Fugit.* 30 ff. As for Galen's linguistic remarks, however, what we need is someone who is against Ulpianism rather than simply pure Attic usage, and this Baldwin does not produce. On the kind of evidence he does use, Galen might just as well be an enemy of Lucian—since he has written against those who correct solecisms, like Lucian, author of the *Solecist.* To say 'the bond between Lucian and Galen was intellectual rather than personal' seems to make too much of very little.

[42] See Cumont, *Une épisode de l'histoire du paganisme au IIme siècle de notre ère, Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiés par l'Académie Royale des Sciences . . . de Belgiques* 40, Brussels 1887; and *RHR* 86 (1922), 202-210; O. Weinreich, *NJklAlt* 24 (1921), 129-51; and Caster's indispensable running commentary, *Études sur Alexandre ou le faux-prophète de Lucien, Thèse supplémentaire*, Paris 1938. On Peregrinus, see the bibliography in Bompaire 478 n. 2; Caster, *Pensée* 237 ff.; H. M. Hornsby, *Hermathena* 23 (1933), 65-84; K. von Fritz in *PW* 37, 656-63; J. Schwartz, *Philopseudes et de Morte Pergrini*², Paris 1963.

[43] For the type, see L. Bieler Θεῖος 'Ανήρ, Diss. Vienna 1935; for aretalogy as a source for Peregrinus (through Theagenes), R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen o.c.* 50 and *supra* 52 ff.

[44] Caster, *Études* 79-93; Bompaire 471-477.

[45] Caster, *Pensée* 241; Helm 308 n. 1.

[46] Bompaire 479, cf. Caster *Pensée* 253.

[47] *PW* 1755; 1730.

[48] *Alexander* cannot have been written earlier than 180 (Θεὸς Μάρκος 48); *Peregrinus* not long after the suicide itself in 165.

[49] *Peregr.* 1, 28; *Alex.* 1.

wider audience for their crimes than their infamous predecessors Empedocles and Tillirobos.[50] They make pretentious claims: Peregrinus has himself compared to Zeus,[51] Alexander to Pythagoras.[52] Both of them learned their quackery from a thaumaturge,[53] rose to prominence, and were quick to exploit the most gullible victims, Christian or Paphlagonian,[54] though their present form of trickery was a last resort.[55] They each made use of a dubious accomplice (Theagenes and Coconnas) [56] and realised the value of advertising their quackery in advance—by making speeches at Olympia or by 'planting' [57] oracles. They implicate fire [58] and moon [59] alike in their exhibitions; they arrange theatrical shams, with Theagenes as deuteragonist [60] or Glycon in the leading role, and they will even change names to keep pace with the growth of the cult.[61] Naturally fools make serious enquiries about their tricks: did Peregrinus' vulture fly east or west, or did Alexander have the soul of Pythagoras? [62] Lucian offers an extended interview with one of the dupes, the old follower of Peregrinus, or the extravagant fool Sacerdos.[63] Of course all rationalists oppose them: [64] Lucian himself challenges both men on the subject of oracles, and narrowly escapes retaliation; [65] and both have to be rescued by conniving governors.[66] Neither is lacking in physical charms, which he put to ignoble use earlier in his career,[67] and both have a hand in an outrage at sea—whether seducing a pupil or murdering Lucian! [68] He can produce medical evidence for

---

[50] *Peregr.* 1; *Alex.* 2.
[51] *Peregr.* 4.
[52] *Alex.* 4.
[53] *Peregr.* 17/*Alex.* 5.
[54] *Peregr.* 11-16/*Alex.* 9.
[55] *Peregr.* 20/*Alex.* 6.
[56] *Peregr.* 4 ff./*Alex.* 6 ff.
[57] *Peregr.* 4 ff./*Alex.* 10 f.
[58] *Peregr.* 36/*Alex.* 47.
[59] *Peregr.* 36/*Alex.* 35, 39.
[60] *Peregr.* 36/*Alex.* 12.
[61] *Peregr.* 27/*Alex.* 58.
[62] *Peregr.* 39/*Alex.* 40.
[63] *Peregr.* 39 f./*Alex.* 43.
[64] *Peregr.* 33/*Alex.* 25.
[65] *Peregr.* 29 ff., cf. 37/*Alex.* 53 ff.
[66] *Peregr.* 14/*Alex.* 57.
[67] *Peregr.* 9/*Alex.* 3, 5.
[68] *Peregr.* 43/*Alex.* 56.

their physical infirmities; [69] and he has even to provide each of them with a 'classical' funeral—if Peregrinus has Hesiodic ceremonies, then Alexander will have Homeric funeral games! [70]

This list goes far beyond Bompaire's catalogue of slanders proper to the ψόγος [71]. Peregrinus and Alexander need have had little in common beyond their success—a quality which is usually enough to antagonise Lucian. With so many parallels to take into account, it is difficult to trust *any* of the individual details: Peregrinus' life may have been influenced by recollections of what Lucian already knew of Alexander; and the *Alexander* itself may have had its details filled out from *Peregrinus*. This makes it impossible to join any attempts to 'reinstate' the two figures,[72] or to defend Lucian's assessment: in either case he is as keen to display his repertoire as to 'expose' his victims. And neither of them was in a position to contradict him.

Both portraits contain a large number of cross-references to the rest of Lucian's stock, in addition to the usual clichés proper to invective. This does not exclude any particular detail from being correct; but it does suggest what sort of details Lucian was predisposed to single out for comment. Peregrinus is involved in a complex scandal about his inheritance: the point at issue, as in *Abdicatus*, is whether a man can go back on disposing of his estate, and Lucian is always interested in scandals of this kind.[73] Peregrinus breaks a ritual prohibition, like Pythagoras,[74] or practises phallic exhibitionism, as Alcidamas does in his *Symposium*: Lucian has a grotesque caricature on the subject in *VH*.[75] Or he resorts to sadism, like the book-collector,[76] and is struck with fennel, as the libertine Cinyrus in *VH* is beaten with mallow.[77] And inevitably he is charged with misconduct against a pupil, like Lucian's fictitious philosophers Timocles and Diphilus.[78] Much of the material in the 'anonymous' speech against Theagenes belongs

---

[69] *Peregr.* 44/*Alex.* 59.
[70] *Peregr.* 41/*Alex.* 60.
[71] 474 f.
[72] Bompaire 478.
[73] *Peregr.* 15 f./*D. Mort.* 5-9.
[74] 16/*D. Mort.* 20.3, *Gall.* 4.
[75] 17/*Conv.* 16, *VH* II.45.
[76] 17/*Adv. Ind.* 25.
[77] *VH* II.26.
[78] 43/*Merc. Cond.* 39; *Conv.* 26.

of course to Lucian's own clichés.[79] Nor is it surprising that the Christians should regard Peregrinus as their 'New Socrates':[80] Lucian draws on the prison scene at Pl. *Phaedo* 60B ff.,[81] just as he does in *Philopseudes*, where the foolish Eucrates is surrounded by fellow-charlatans.

When he can draw so much material from his normal ammunition, there is no need to refer back to a lost 'aretalogy' on Peregrinus. It is clear instead that the suicide gave Lucian the kind of literary opportunities[82] he could scarcely resist, and he did not need any provocation from Theagenes before making capital out of the event. Nor would he have to wait until a cult of Peregrinus was set up, since he assigns statues or rites to any other character without hesitation: Timon,[83] Toxaris, and Empedocles[84] have their fair share. If any other reason is needed, it is most probably that Peregrinus' activities at the Olympic Games eclipsed his own. He makes it clear elsewhere[85] that he regards the games as a platform for the ambitious rhetorician.[86]

Against this background it is clearly impossible to 'solve' the riddle of Peregrinus' character or motives.[87] His type of ostentation was a natural symptom of the second century with its love of theatricality:[88] but this is the charge that Lucian was perhaps most readily inclined to supply, regardless of his victim.[89] Nor can we suspect that patricide was a formative factor in Peregrinus'

---

[79] Δραπετεύειν ἐκ τοῦ βίου 21/*Fugitivi*; Heracles' cremation 21/*Herm.* 7, *D. Deor.* 13.1; the bull of Phalaris 21/*Phalaris*; Peregrinus half-burnt, 25/Empedocles, *Icar.* 13, cf. Xanthus, *D. Mar.* 11; as a quack healer and a night-spirit 28/Pellichus, *Philops.* 19 f.

[80] *Peregr.* 12 (Bompaire 479).

[81] At *Peregr.* 37 Lucian confirms this borrowing by alluding to pictures of Socrates in prison surrounded by his followers.

[82] See also *supra* 52 ff.

[83] *Timon* 51.

[84] *Scytha* 2; *Icar.* 13.

[85] *Herod.* 7.

[86] This resentment would certainly explain Lucian's casual remark that these games were the finest he had seen (35). Schwartz *ad loc.* comments 'pour des motives que nous ignorons'. But why should Lucian trouble to tell us at all, unless to contrast the splendour of the festival with Peregrinus' sorry exhibition 'on the fringe'? It is best to understand this remark as part of Lucian's fabrication.

[87] Cf. *supra* 55 f.

[88] H. Hornsby, *Hermathena* 23 (1933), 65-84.

[89] Cf. *Icar.* 29; *Pisc.* 32; *Pseudolog.* 19; and *supra* 42.

mental attitude:[90] this is the very charge we can least afford to take for granted.

The *Alexander* can be explained in a similar way. Once again there is no need to insist on a literary source, and it is perhaps stretching the text too far to extract a parody of the Alexander-Romance.[91] One might just as easily attempt to read *Peregrinus* as a parody of Euripides on the death of Heracles; in each case we have no more than a few obvious comparisons; and since Alexander is actually the conqueror's namesake, Lucian was almost bound to include them. But if he had intended to turn them into any significant development, he could have carried them much further, as in *Navig.* 28-38, where Samippus imagines himself re-enacting Alexander's Persian campaigns. But Lucian's special interest here is Alexander's oracles,[92] and the biographical details are incidental: he can supply them partly from stock, partly from experience—and not without a backward glance at *Peregrinus.*

Once more there is some degree of overlap with situations elsewhere in Lucian. Alexander's accomplice Coconnas apparently dies from the bite of a viper. Since the prophet himself dies from a fitting disease of the foot, it is tempting to suspect that Lucian merely invented an equally appropriate fate for his companion (he may of course have invented Alexander's as well[93]). Coconnas had been handling tame snakes, and stories about reptiles come easily to Lucian elsewhere.[94] Also, he dwells on the complexities of Alexander's administration (23 ff.); these are not unlike the problems in Olympus, a much more frequent subject in Lucian: Zeus has to supervise the other gods, including Apollo, always on guard against oracle-testers and kept busy by requests; and like Alexander, the god has a sorting-office of requests and portents.[95] A. D. Nock noticed that Alexander acts as an intercessor who judiciously postpones people's hopes of advancement and inheritance.[96] Apart from Christian and Gnostic Saints, strict parallels in antiquity are not common. But they do come easily

[90] E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety,* Cambridge 1968, 63.
[91] Bompaire 619 f.
[92] *Infra* 124 ff.
[93] *Alex.* 10/59.
[94] *Philops.* 11 ff., *Dips.*
[95] *Bis Acc.* 1 f., *Icar.* 25 f.
[96] *Alex.* 22/*CQ* 22 (1928), 161 f.

to Lucian: the priest in *Saturnalia* seems to fulfil a similar role between men and Cronos; and Lucian will present the gods themselves as the crafty middle-men, not the real divine powers, who still enjoy the rewards from men; and like Alexander, they are skilled prevaricators and prophets.[97] The *pseudomantis* is cast in terms all too familiar to Lucian.

His other rogues' gallery has been less thoroughly explored. In the first part of *Historia* (14-32) he cites samples from some dozen writers, mostly unnamed, who have set themselves up as historians of the Parthian War. Few scholars have questioned the existence of this motley collection: Crepereius ('Obscurus') is suspect, and so is the prophetic historian; [98] but only one scholar [99] has dismissed them all, and otherwise they have won general acceptance. Croiset forgave Lucian for being carried away by moral indignation against the untruthful historians of his day; and Bompaire gives him yet another literary source: 'le traité ... recèle l'actualité littéraire la moins contestable. Par lui seul nous connaissons l'existence et l'inexpérience des historiens'.[100]

We have already seen, however, that some of the examples, and Lucian's way of introducing them, need not necessarily be taken at their face value.[101] The historians themselves have also some familiar features. We have to notice that the philosopher who writes history (17) has the usual trappings which Lucian assigns to the bogus philosopher at every opportunity—beard, syllogism, and dialectic: and Lucian distributes most of the other features in his caricature of philosophers round the other historians: of course they are ignorant (29), voluble (22), given to flattery (14), and a discredit to their calling (13); or they exchange a menial's calling for a lofty one (16), and even have the philosopher's preoccupation with luxury food (26). All these traits will be found applied to the philosopher in *Fugit.* 12-17.[102]

Otherwise the historians are cast in the same mould as all

---

[97] *Sat.* 10,19 ff.; *J. Conf.* 11, 12-19.

[98] *Hist.* 15/Homeyer *Commentary* 21 and n. 27, 22; *Hist.* 31/Bompaire 606 n. 4.

[99] G. Wirth, *Historia* 13 (1964), 234 f. But his suspicions are tied to a view of Lucian's relationship to Arrian which cannot be fully proven.

[100] Croiset 47, Bompaire 483. For *Historia* in relation to Fronto's *de Bello Parthico*, see J. Revay, *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* I (1951), 161-90 (Summary in French: see *L'Année Philologique*, 1952, 66).

[101] *Supra* 59 ff., cf. 41 f., 47 f.

[102] Cf. *Pisc.* 31-37; *Icar.* 29-31.

Lucian's liars. When they talk about distances, they tell lies not just by parasangs, but by whole furlongs at a time,[103] as Menippus does after his trip to heaven, *Icar.* 1; or they transport whole districts in the same way as Lucian's gods move mountains, as Tau removes Hymettus from Attica, or as Samippus lifts Lycinus by wishful thinking from Athens to Babylon.[104] One historian describes an imagined engagement in Parthia, seen on a walk between the Kraneion and Lerna—just as Adimantus dreams of a shipwreck while walking from the Piraeus to Athens.[105] And Lucian leaves one of the lying historians in mid-flow, just as he left the charlatan Peregrinus, or as Tychiades leaves the philosophers in the midst of their tall stories; [106] even closer is the instance in *D. Meretr.*, where the girl leaves the *miles gloriosus* still recounting his improbable campaigns.[107]

The historians' names are also a clue: Lucian knows how to forge exotic names and places for corroborative effect.[108] This does not mean that any particular name is impossible; but it is suspicious that Callimorphus ('Formosus')[109] should turn out to be the author of a shapeless diary; while Creperius Calpurnianus of Pompeiopolis (15) or Demetrius of Sagalassus (32) remind us that Lucian enjoys collecting polysyllabic titles (he himself is Parrhesiades son of Alethion son of Elenxicles, and his avaricious philosophers are Ktesons or Ktesippuses or Ktesikleses or Euktemons or Polykteteses).[110] He seems to make a point of leaving his philosopher-historian anonymous (17): Homeyer *ad loc.* explains that he is 'nach diatribischer Manier . . . vage und inkonsequent.' But Lucian has other reasons. To pretend that he knows the name

---

[103] *Hist.* 24/*Icar.* 1.

[104] Samosata, *Hist.* 24/*Charon* 4 f., *Iud. Voc.* 8, *Navig.* 35.

[105] 29/*Navig.* 14.

[106] 15/*Peregr.* 32, *Philops.* 38 f.

[107] 9.2, cf. 13.4.

[108] *Rh. Pr.* 17. Baldwin (*Studies in Lucian o.c.* 82) argues that there is no point in Lucian's assigning an invented historian to Miletus (14). But he has to come from somewhere, to contrast with Homer, whose birthplace is unknown; and where better than the home of Hecataeus, the Ionian revolt, and the Milesian tales?

[109] Baldwin (*Studies o.c.* 83) denies the pun's existences.

[110] For Parrhesiades, *Pisc.* 19 (Homeyer *o.c.* 21); for Kteson etc., *Fugit.* 26. See also *Neky.* 20 and Bompaire 702 f. Baldwin (*ibid*). argues that Pompeiopolis is in fact a real place. But it was in Paphlagonia, and Lucian tells us elsewhere what he thought of the fools who lived in that part of the world (*Alex.* 17).

may in itself be no more than a corroborative detail: elsewhere he lets someone remain anonymous or affects not to know his name when it is clear from the context that he is humorously referring to himself.[111] And he can also affect to be embarrassed even for fictitious philosophers, or pretend to shield them from the public at large by disclosing their names only in the strictest confidence.[112]

When the contents and character of these historians are taken together, it is clear that Lucian only needed the war itself to provide the basis for his satire. He himself had the resources to manufacture a horde of muddling liars for the occasion, as a 'topical' variation on his caricature of philosophers or rhetoricians. This is not to say that incredibly incompetent historians did not exist, or that any single practice which Lucian caricatures did not reflect current abuses.[113] Doctors could indeed write campaign histories (16): Trajan's physician Statilius Crito undoubtedly did, though Lucian was probably thinking of his usual *bête noire* Ctesias.[114] The novelist Xenophon of Ephesus may also have been the local historian of that name,[115] and such people may have been all the more liable to write romantic histories; and of course the archaising tendencies of the sophistic movement affected every kind of cultural activity,[116] so that the absurd imitations of Homeric or Ionic dialect or the grotesque blend of Latin and pure Attic (22, 16, 15) were indeed matters of current concern. Bompaire dismisses the historian who prophesies the end of the war (31) as caricature, because the passage contains an allusion to Alexander-histories (483). But it is noteworthy that the novelist Iamblichus

---

[111] *Eun.* 10, *Peregr.* 31.

[112] *Herm.* 9; *Conv.* 3. It is not possible either to believe in the authenticity of Lucian's addressee Philo 'in view of its other more tangible bearers, and because it features elsewhere in Lucian' (Baldwin *o.c.* 81). It would be easier to swallow if Lucian did *not* use the name elsewhere. The case Baldwin cites from *Conv.* is quite obviously fictitious, like the ἑταῖρος in *Icar.*—to say nothing of Philocles (*Philops.*), Philinus (*Lex.* 4), or Philiades (*Tim.* 47).

[113] The fragments of Fronto's *de Bello Parthico* illustrate the worst kind of ancient history written to order. See J. Revay *o.c.*, and cf. B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto 1973, 82, 93.

[114] *FGH* 200, *SEG* XV.700. He attacks Ctesias in *Hist.* 39, as well as in *VH* (I.3).

[115] For these and other historical curiosities in the second century see Bowie, *Past and Present* 46 (1970), 10-28.

[116] Bowie *ibid.* 3-41.

actually claimed credit for forecasting the end of the war.[117] Lucian could easily have drawn on such a character, developing the novelistic aspects of his work in *Hist.* 28 f., but ascribing his prophecy to someone else—and all without our knowing. What we can safely say is that the historians *could* have existed, but that Lucian's compulsive tendency to embellish makes it highly unlikely. Our knowledge of Aelius Aristides assures us that the characters in Lucian's *Philopseudes* could easily have been authentic; but since Lucian uses their names again in entirely fictitious situations (e.g. *Conv.*) it is clear that they are not. Again, the *Lexiphanes* does reflect genuine archaistic tendencies, but would Lucian merely report a bizarre speech if he could parody it instead? The technique would come as easily here: Lucian's historians need be no more real—and no less—than Eucrates or 'Lexiphanes'.

When Lucian could manipulate the life of Alexander of Abonoteichos to suit his own purposes, then he could also distort his own. Some details he could scarcely have any motive to invent, such as the fact that he sent his father and family on to Amastris, just before Alexander's attempt on his life; [118] and sometimes he can attach favourite motifs to his own person in a way which does not affect his own biography: he pretends to know that his opponents will compare him to the inevitable tragic actor—without actually having to invent a career for himself on the stage! [119] But these are the exception. His conversions are suspiciously like those of Dio of Prusa or Justin Martyr,[120] as we should suspect in such a bookish age. For Bompaire 'tout se passe comme si dans son œuvre (Lucien) reconstruisait sa vie idéalement'.[121] A number of the tiniest details belong to his usual repertoire, and where they coincide with reality it is only coincidence.

Lucian tells us about his one day as a sculptor: he has conflated two of his favourite sources, and cast himself as a latter-day Socrates and Pheidippides at once.[122] But the latter had merely modelled houses, ships, carts, and frogs before he went to learn his trade. Lucian did not stop at trivia, but wanted to make

---

[117] Photius *Cod.* 94.75b.
[118] *Alex.* 56.
[119] *Apol.* 5.
[120] G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie*, Leipzig 1907, I.293 ff.
[121] Bompaire 530.
[122] *Somn.* 2/*Nub.* 878 ff. (Bompaire 531).

little gods and tiny statuettes. This is simply another opportunity to smile at statues of the gods;[123] and we should notice several other passages where he is amused by children and their toys: Ganymede and Cupid playing knuckle-bones; the baby Hermes playing with the Caduceus, but wanting to try his hand at the thunderbolt; or Cupids playing soldiers in Alexander's armour.[124] It is no surprise that Lucian should cast his own schooldays in a similar mould; he admits to this audience that his yarn has been γελάσιμα καὶ μειρακιώδη (*Somn.* 5).

Again, he could easily have gone to Rome to see an oculist, as he claims in *Nigrinus*. But this is strikingly convenient as a prelude to keen vision for the soul;[125] and Philostratus tells a similar conversion-story about Aristocles of Pergamum.[126] Moreover Lucian applies to himself the same treatment as he gives to Charon or Menippus: both of them receive a remarkable vision to give them new insight into the life of mankind.[127]

At *Herm.* 24 'Lycinus' claims that a philosopher promised him a way to the ideal city fifteen years before, but that he refused to listen. This incident has often been taken to refer to Lucian's 'conversion' to philosophy by Nigrinus; but *Hermotimus* is particularly rich in cross-references: no matter when Lucian wrote *Nigrinus*, we should still expect him to find room for some of the material in his most comprehensive work. Moreover the episode is parallel to two situations outside *Nigrinus*: in *Vit. Auct.* 17 the Platonist tells a prospective buyer about his city; and in *Gall.* 11 Micyllus has no time to listen to a lecture from the old philosopher *Thesmopolis* ('Found-city'). Again, we were told that Hermotimus himself took up philosophy twenty years previously when he was about Lycinus' present age;[128] and Hermotimus is about sixty—not surprisingly the same age as Thesmopolis.[129] Bompaire rightly notes[130] that this makes Lucian about forty both on his 'conversion' to philosophy[131] and here, where he is bitterly rejecting

---

123 *Philops.* 14 (a clay Cupid); *pro Imag.* 23, *Timon* 4.
124 *D. Deor.* 4.3; *D. Deor.* 7.3 f.; *Herod.* 5 cf. *Hist.* 23.
125 *Nigr.* 2/4.
126 *VS* 567.
127 *Charon* 7, *Icar.* 13 ff.
128 *Herm.* 13.
129 *Gall.* 10.
130 529.
131 *Bis Acc.* 32.

the schools. But we should also note that this twenty-year gap between the professional and the novice appears again in a very different context: at *D. Meretr.* 8.1 f., the courtesan who has been twenty years in the profession gives advice to the novice of eighteen! It is only too easy for Lucian to spin *any* incident round a few significant figures.

His victims then are practically interchangeable, and his self-portrait is blatant pastiche. When we come to his traditional figures it is no surprise to find that he is content to manipulate the character to suit the needs of his plots. Lucian's Anacharsis *looks* original. To Bompaire he is complex and ambiguous—part of the author's 'création fantaisiste' [132]. In *Anacharsis* Lucian has contrived a battle of wits between Solon and the Scythian sage, and the noble savage is made to hold his own in dialectic against the Athenian. Lucian manages the dialogue in the same way as he does in *Charon*, where the ferryman is cast as an unsophisticated outsider, whose abilities gradually reveal themselves beyond expectation—the boor Charon can rival even Hermes with his recitations from Homer! [133]

But *Anacharsis* must also be seen in relation to Lucian's other 'Scythian' dialogue *Toxaris*. There it is the Greek Mnesippus who fails to understand Scythian institutions, and although he comes to a stalemate in his competition with the Scythian, the final paragraph gives him the advantage: he will be a friend but not a Scythian one, and he is not taken in by any of Toxaris' tall stories.[134] In *Anacharsis* on the other hand it is the Scythian who begins by disbelieving the Greek institutions, and remains sceptical about them to the end.[135] The two pieces are therefore a contrived pair, and Anacharsis has the same role as the Greek Mnesippus in the other dialogue.[136] Lucian is more interested in chiasmus than in consistency.

---

[132] 740; cf. 678-82 (Anacharsis in historical exempla and Cynic tradition). For some minor adjustments in Lucian's portrait, see S. Walz, *Geschichtlichen Kenntnisse o.c.* 34.

[133] *Charon* 7 ff., 14, 19, 22.

[134] *Tox.* 63; 56.

[135] For the evidence that he has won the argument, see *infra* 114 ff.

[136] Hirzel (II.287) makes a pair of *Toxaris* and *Scytha*. But *Anach.* and *Tox.* are much more nearly equal in scale; and both are dialogues, while *Scytha* is nothing more than a short *prolalia*; and the chiasmus between the two pairs of characters is decisively in favour of taking the two dialogues as a pair.

The same kind of problem arises in *Timon*. Lucian's hero simply does not turn out according to anyone's expectations. He begins as the traditional misanthrope, and only asks the gods to take revenge on the parasites who have ruined him; he knows he is better off without wealth,[137] and yet Ploutos wins him over with only a short speech, so that he duly discovers treasure and turns into a miser.[138] Scholars have repeatedly tried to 'explain' this curious volte-face, known only to Lucian: he could either be using a lost branch of the Timon tradition, or making a poor attempt to contaminate two contradictory ones.[139] But is he sufficiently concerned about Timon as a character at all? His hero begins with an attack on Providence: if Zeus counts for anything, he should blast wrongdoers like Timon's flatterers. As usual in Lucian, the gods find out too late that their bluff has been called: the thunderbolt is in disrepair, so that the only way Zeus can punish the flatterers is by making them jealous, and this means afflicting Timon with wealth a second time.[140] As a result he is no better off—a rich misanthrope instead of a poor one, and neither wealth nor Providence can restore him to his former self.[141] Lucian could easily have worked out this presentation of Timon by conflating several characteristic motifs: the work is as much a satire of Providence as a study of Timon himself; and as usual Providence lets down its devoted servant. We can compare the plot of *J. Trag.*, where the gods can do nothing to help the faithful Timocles to defend them against the atheists, and of course Zeus is again unable to use the thunderbolt;[142] while in *Saturnalia* Cronos can do very little to support the poor, when Zeus is not enforcing the laws.[143] Moreover Lucian is far more interested in comic conversion-scenes for their own sakes than in the character-portraits on either side of them: Lycinus wins over Hermotimus in an instant after his twenty stubborn years as a Stoic;[144] or Lucian recounts his own 'conversion' in *Nigrinus*

---

[137] *Timon* 4-7; 35-37.
[138] 38; 41 ff.
[139] Bompaire 169 ff. For the problem as a whole, see *infra* 90 ff.; for *Timon* and the treasure, *infra* 107 ff.
[140] 1-10.
[141] 42 ff. cf. 8.
[142] *J. Trag.* 24-32.
[143] *Sat.* 2, 25.
[144] *Herm.* 71.

in a manner which makes it very difficult to see what he has really been converted to;[145] and Micyllus was enthralled by gold but is suddenly won over to accept his poverty.[146] In effect Lucian has taken the opportunity to write two complementary studies on the effects of wealth: Micyllus is finally converted from avarice, while Timon is converted to it. Now Micyllus' conversion is not even consistent with his role elsewhere in Lucian,[147] we need expect no greater consistency in the handling of Timon.

---

[145] For the resulting 'problem' see Bompaire 511 n. 1.
[146] *Gall.* 33.
[147] *supra* 67.

CHAPTER FIVE

ROME

We have seen how freely Lucian transposes motifs, even when dealing with contemporary persons or events; his handling of Rome and Romans is simply an extension of the problem. His general attitude is clear: the national enemies are not Romans, but Persians or Scythians.[1] The question that remains is one of detail: how are we to relate the few distinctively Roman touches to his own work?

Lucian's *Nigrinus* and *de Mercede Conductis* have a number of points of contact with Roman Satire, and several explanations have been offered: he could at least have known of Juvenal or others through Roman friends,[2] or even set out to 'answer' Juvenal's attack on the Greeks;[3] but he might equally well have drawn on the commonplaces used by most Graeco-Roman moralists;[4] or he could be voicing a genuine disgust against Rome from his own experience. Recent scholarship has drifted to extremes: Peretti[5] and his followers have attempted to see a revolutionary undertone in Lucian's attacks; while Bompaire prefers tradition to reality at all costs, and insists that he must have had a 'source' in Roman Satire.[6] But in both pamphlets he has used a wide range

---

[1] For the attitude of Greek intellectuals to the Empire, see J. H. Oliver, *The Ruling Power: a Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides*, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43.4 (1953), 873-1003; J. Palm, *Rōm, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Lund 1959 (on Lucian 44-56, both concise and sensible); also G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1969, *passim*, esp. 76-88, and C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford 1971.

[2] Helm, *LM* 219.

[3] J. Mesk, *WSt* 34 (1913), 14 f.

[4] W. Capelle, *BPhW* 34 (1914), 273-4, cf. Bompaire 502 ff.

[5] A. Peretti, *Luciano, Un intellettuale greco contro Roma*, Florence 1946; for this irrepressible controversy, see Bompaire 499-512. B. Baldwin, *CQ N.S.* 11 (1961), 199-208, still defended Peretti, but recently recants (*Studies o.c.* 107 ff.); Hall refutes him adequately, 175-194. Lucian can afford to be as much a revolutionary as Aristophanes—and no more.

[6] 508.

of his usual motifs,[7] and this affects his choice and treatment of stock 'Roman' themes.

He describes the *nomenclator* in a Roman context (*Nigr.* 21/*Merc. Cond.* 10); but he can sneer at superfluous retinue against any other background—whether it takes the form of tyrants' doryphors, philosophers' litter-bearers, or Alexander of Abonoteichos' staff of Eumolpids and Kerukes—from Paphlagonia![8] And the Greek parvenu Simon has followers at hand to correct anyone who forgets his new name Simonides.[9] In Rome the servants go ahead to warn their masters where to walk (*Nigr.* 34): while the detail is authentic,[10] Lucian's objection is familiar enough—the rich wasters borrow other people's eyes. Plutarch cites a similar criticism as a Spartan *bon mot* (foreigners borrow others' hands to tie their shoes);[11] and Lucian uses the motif of 'borrowed eyes' in his fantastic tales: Scythians or Selenites take each other's eyes—literally![12] And he explains Roman courtesies in terms of Persian *proskynesis* (*Nigr.* 21); while the Greek charlatan Alexander of Abonoteichos has a similar ritual for bestowing or denying kisses.[13] He mentions *salutatio* in both the Roman pieces,[14] but it can appear in any contrast between rich and poor, regardless of place: philosophers in Athens disgrace themselves by jostling at rich men's doors.[15] Lucian does mention the early hours for social calls in Rome, but he does not treat them as exclusively Roman, since even this can appear in *Navigium* in a distinctly 'Attic' setting.[16] Nor can all the parallels which Bompaire singles out from Juvenal claim to be distinctive (507). The *salutator* must be content with no more than a mere glance;[17] but Lucian will make his arrogant victims inaccessible to the crowd in any

[7] For *Nigr.*, see L. Hasenclever, *Ueber Lucians Nigrinos*, Diss. Munich 1907, 18-21; the texture of *Merc. Cond.* is very similar, despite Helm's assertion that the crossreferences are 'natürlich bei der Eigenart des Stoffes spärlich' (*PW* 1751).
[8] *Katapl.* 26, cf. *Gall.* 24; *Gall.* 10; *Alex.* 39.
[9] *Gall.* 14.
[10] *Sat.* 30.
[11] *Mor.* 240E.
[12] *Tox.* 40; *VH* I.25.
[13] *Alex.* 41, 55.
[14] *Nigr.* 22; *Merc. Cond.* 30 f.
[15] *Pisc.* 34.
[16] *Navig.* 22.
[17] *Nigr.* 21/*Juv.* III.185.

other context—in an Attic, oriental, or contemporary setting.[18] And the *salutator* can expect sleepless nights [19]—like other fools satirised by Lucian, from misers and lovers to Zeus himself.[20]

For Lucian legacy-hunting is merely another branch of *kolakeia*. Once more it need not be confined to Roman Satire, and could still be a topical subject in Greek circles: Philostratus mentions a crafty cook who was able to cheat Scopelian of his father's estate, with details reminiscent of Lucian's *D. Mort*; [21] and most of the latter's examples take place in Greek contexts.[22] The only 'Roman' detail in *Nigrinus* is that they tell the truth only once in their lives, on their deathbeds; but so does the Greek Polystratus in *D. Mort.*[23]

Lucian's Romans are preoccupied with dinners, and the rabble disgrace themselves at table, unlike the true philosopher (*Nigr.* 22). But his victims will misbehave at dinner in any other setting: men shame the gods; philosophers affront their patrons; the poor embarrass the rich; and the gods themselves fight over places or ambrosia.[24] The Romans use scent or flowers out of season (31); but even this practice does occur in Greek contexts—Aelian notes that Demetrius Poliorcetes sprinkles his tables with myrrh and unseasonable flowers; and Hermocrates the sophist asked for frankincense to stuff a partridge, since it was scarce at Pergamum.[25] Lucian uses similar touches in a fantastic guise: the diners in the Isles of the Blest have a quaint device for sprinkling myrrh, and because the seasons are static and vintages frequent, they too can have rare produce all the year round.

The parallels between *de Mercede Conductis* and Petronius have been less fully explored, but Lucian's approach is no different here. The scholar turned flatterer was a theme available in Greek literature,[26] and he could fill out the details as required. At *Merc. Cond.* 15 the uninitiated guest is liable to make *faux pas* when visiting the rich boor—as Encolpius does when visiting Trimal-

---

[18] *Navig.* 22, *Gall.* 24, *Alex.* 42.
[19] *Nigr.* 22.
[20] *Timon* 14, *Gall.* 29; *D. Deor.* 6.4, *D. Meretr.* 11; *Bis Acc.* 2.
[21] *VS* 517/*D. Mort.* 7; 9.4.
[22] *Gall.* 12, 14; *Timon* 22; *D. Mort.* 5-9.
[23] *Nigr.* 30/*Sat.* 71; cf. *D. Mort.* 9.3.
[24] *Sacr.* 9, *Sat.* 38; *Conv.* 34 and *passim*; *D. Deor.* 13.1, *J. Trag.* 13.
[25] *VH* IX.9, Philostratus *VS* 611.
[26] E.g. Plut. *Mor.* 60A; *Epict.* I.26.9.

chio; [27] but in *Gallus* the pauper Micyllus is also embarrassed on his first visit to dine with the rich Eucrates. Like Trimalchio, Lucian's rich Roman has a revolting favourite; [28] but in his own symposium one of the guests tries to seduce a young servant, while another is corrupting the host's son. The Alexandrian dwarf also appears in the Greek setting of Lucian's *Convivium*. The upstart historian has no control over his literary appetite, and has been compared to Petronius' parvenu.[29] But there is an equally valid parallel in Epictetus, where a novice buys a whole treatise and has indigestion over it; [30] and Lucian presents his incongruous parvenu Simon in an 'Attic' setting.[31]

Only one feature common to *Merc. Cond.* and Petronius is not to be found elsewhere in Lucian: the motif of escaping from an outrageous dinner thanks to reports of a fire.[32] But Lucian introduces various disasters to end his parties in confusion: a bloody brawl, a bully breaking in, or a palace revolution are all in order here.[33] And in *Merc. Cond.* the fire is only one of two mishaps to break up the party. By pairing it with earthquake Lucian detracts from its 'Roman' flavour: the most he needed to know was that Rome was notorious for its fire risks.

Horse-racing and its partisans are not exclusively Roman either (*Nigr.* 29); it was just as much a vice of Alcibiades or Anniceris of Cyrene.[34] Lucian was familiar with the opening of Aristophanes' *Clouds*, which he echoes in the opening of *Gallus*, so that in his eyes even this was an 'Attic' subject, and appears as such in *Timon*.[35] In its Roman guise it leads into two of Lucian's *bêtes noires*—pretentious statues [36] and the mob's enthusiasm.[37] Lucian cannot make his usual 'Cynic' attacks on athletics in Rome: horse-racing is a convenient substitute.

---

[27] *Merc. Cond.* 15/*Sat.* 30, cf. *Gall.* 10 f.
[28] *Merc. Cond.* 33/*Sat.* 28; cf. *Conv.* 15, 26.
[29] *Merc. Cond.* 17, cf. *Hist.* 20, 56, which Hirschfeld compared with *Sat.* 76, 36 (*RhM N.F.* 51, 1896, 470 f.).
[30] I.26.116.
[31] *Gall.* 14. There is no significance in the proverbs common to Lucian and Petronius, as Th. Rein realized (*Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten bei Lukian*, Diss. Tübingen 1894, 99 f.)
[32] *Merc. Cond.* 18/*Sat.* 78.
[33] *Conv.* 43 ff.; *D. Meretr.* 15; *Icar.* 15, *Katapl.* 11, cf. *D. Mort.* 14.3.
[34] *Nigr.* 29/Plut. *Mor.* 52E; Aelian *VH* II.27.
[35] *Timon* 23.
[36] *Peregr.* 41; *Gall.* 24 f.; *Timon* 51.
[37] E.g. *Hist.* 1-2.

Apart from the 'Roman' subjects, many of the other parallels cited from Juvenal by Mesk [38] and others can be suspected for the same reasons. Like Umbricius, Nigrinus withdraws from the vices round about him.[39] But so do most of the patient idealists in Lucian: [40] Penia, Philosophy herself, true philosophers, Justice and Hermotimus [41] all take their leave and stand aloof from mankind.

It is clear, then, that Lucian has combined each of the few peculiarly Roman institutions with some *bête noire* of his own. It is reasonable to assume that neither piece was destined for a gathering of Roman dignitaries; and he had no real incentive to display a Roman literary source to a Greek audience. He inserts the bare minimum needed to identify Rome at all—seven hills instead of an Acropolis,[42] a different time of day for social calls, and a new kind of gluttony.[43] This is scarcely the kind of information that needs to come from books: one does not read Spanish satire to know about bullfights or garlic, when they are the basic ingredients of national prejudice. We should perhaps remember a certain inauspicious occasion when Lucian *himself* admitted to making an early morning call on a (Roman) patron (*pro Lapsu* 1). But when he can find room for Cynic clichés in Lychnopolis, it is no surprise that he includes them in fifth-century Athens or contemporary Rome alike.

---

[38] *WSt* 35 (1913), 2 ff.
[39] Juv. III.14 f./*Nigr.* 18.
[40] *Timon* 33; *Fugit.* 3; *Charon* 21; *Bis Acc.* 5; *Herm.* 5.
[41] No comment is called for on coincidences like *Nigr.* 35/Juv. III. 315 (ταῦτά τε καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα διελθὼν κατέπαυσε τὸν λόγον/*his alias poteram et pluris subnectere causas*, nor on material which was accessible to Lucian directly from his favourite portions of Plato (*Nigr.* 35/*Juv.* III. 23/*R.* 614B).
[42] cf. *Merc. Cond.* 26.
[43] *Nigr.* 31.

CHAPTER SIX

DRAMA I:
TIMON AND THE MINIATURES

Lucian's most characteristic works are the dramatic sketches in which he has translated Comic subject-matter into the medium of Platonic Dialogue. He knew at least five plays of Aristophanes at first hand, and in a large number of cases his borrowings are obvious and direct.[1] But a number of Comic parallels are still open to discussion. He is still transferring and blending motifs in the usual way, and once more his general stock has to be taken into account.

The *Timon* is his most sustained imitation of Old Comedy. There was a considerable ancient tradition surrounding Timon, but nothing quite like Lucian's version.[2] Now the dramatic date of the piece falls neatly between 430 and 424;[3] but the cross-references to other works of Lucian are strikingly numerous.[4] Did he adapt a lost Comedy, or did he simply know a vague outline of Timon's career, which he then embellished with 'Attic' details, comic reminiscences, and a few Cynic motifs?[5] Or did a lost Comedy provide him with some of these motifs for the first time? The problem seems typically circular. But a variety of internal evidence shows that Lucian took his material from very close at hand, and wove it together in the usual way.

The key passage is *Timon* 10, which looks deceptively like a typical incident from Old Comedy. Zeus sends a thunderbolt against Anaxagoras, but Pericles protects him, so that the bolt burns down the Anakeion instead. Three of Lucian's usual sources provide the main motifs. The gods hit their own temples, as at Ar. *Nub.* 401. Lucian uses Anaxagoras only here, but he did not

---

[1] *Supra* 6 f., 23 ff.

[2] For the tortuous succession of theories—Comedy, biography and rhetorical tradition—see the valuable summary in G. Hertel, *Die Allegorie von Reichtum und Armut, Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft,* Nürnberg 1969, 48 ff.

[3] Legrand *REA* 9 (1907), 143.

[4] Mesk *RhM N.F.* 70 (1915), 107-144.

[5] See Bompaire 169 ff., 225 f., 320 ff.

have far to look for the name, when Anaxagoras and Pericles appear as a pair at Pl. *Phaedr.* 270A. The underlying motif here, however, is that a cultured patron protects a lover of wisdom from destruction. But again Lucian knew Pl. *Gorg.* 526C, where Rhadamanthus saves the philosopher's soul from Tartarus: and he has worked the theme through many different contexts.[6] Two other motifs scarcely require a source: Zeus does not like men who put the gods to petty inconvenience,[7] and he usually finds a good excuse for not using thunderbolts.[8] It is futile to look for a single source here—but Lucian's school repertoire is very much in evidence.

We can explain other situations in the same way. At *Timon* 24 Ploutos admits that it is unjust for Aristides to be poor while Hipponicus and Callias are rich. But Lucian is only applying a familiar rhetorical formula: unjust men often prosper in pairs, whatever the context—Callias and Alcibiades, Meidias and Charops, Anytus and Meletus, or Hyperbolus and Cleon.[9] Here Lucian needed only another 'historical' pair, and he had only to fall back on yet another favourite passage of Aristophanes to find Hipponicus and Callias together.[10] Nor is it surprising that Gnathonides threatens to indict Timon before the Areopagus (46). We should not attempt to argue about the Court's status at any particular period.[11] Lucian introduces it at the slightest provocation quite regardless of the dramatic date.[12] The same applies to Timon's victory at Acharnae—when he had not even been present (50). Again this looks like authentic Old Comedy. But this is another instance of Lucian's 'Comic battles', an imaginary engagement like all the rest.[13] Since he knows that Acharnae contains rich agricultural land (cf. *Icar.* 18), and shows knowledge

---

[6] *Peregr.* 14; *D. Mort.* 30.3; *Neky.* 13; cf *supra* 17. It was also in general circulation, as shown by Philostratus *VS* 516: the gods protect the sophist Scopelian from their own thunderbolt, which kills eight reapers instead.

[7] Peregrinus, *Fugit.* 1; Croesus, *Bis Acc.* 1; cf. Otus and Ephialtes, *Icar.* 23.

[8] *Icar.* 33, *J. Trag.* 24 f., *Fugit.* 22.

[9] *J. Conf.* 16; *Pisc.* 10, *Timon* 30.

[10] *Av.* 283. (In 276 ff. strangers in the bird world witness a parade of curious birds, cf. *VH* I.13 ff.; Lucian uses airborne camels in *Icar.* 10, cf. *Av.* 278).

[11] See Legrand *REG* 20 (1907), 211 n. 5; J. Delz, *Lukians Kenntnisse der athenischen Antiquitäten*, Fribourg 1950, 150, 180; Bompaire 523.

[12] *Bis Acc.* 4; *Pisc.* 15; *Vit. Auct.* 7; *Herm.* 64; *Anach.* 19; *D. Meretr.* 7.2.

[13] *Supra* 36 ff.

of Aristophanes' *Acharnians* elsewhere (*Pisc.* 1 ff.) he could easily deduce that it was a likely spot for an engagement.

It is quite clear, then, that Lucian had all the material for a synthetic 'Comedy' within his usual narrow range of sources. There has never been any reasonable doubt, however, that he has used the outline of Aristophanes' *Plutus*, and may have set out to write an 'anti-Plutus' of his own. Aristophanes' hero Chremylus starts poor and becomes rich: Timon starts rich, becomes poor, then has a second windfall; and their two characters are completely opposite. Helm argued, however, that Lucian shows so little knowledge of the details that he could only have known the play at second hand.[14] It seems more likely, however, that Lucian selected only those details which coincided most readily with a rhetorician's repertoire.

He scarcely needed to go to a Comedy to find the topos that Wealth benefits the unjust[15] or that Ploutos will become as sharp-eyed as Lynceus:[16] he uses both clichés often enough elsewhere. And any references to ancient Hellenic institutions were welcome to a second-century audience. Aristophanes' Zeus is poor because he can only afford an olive wreath at the Olympic Games. It is no surprise to find Lucian using this joke in three different guises: Timon points out that a wreath is all the recognition Zeus is likely to get; and elsewhere Zeus tells Menippus that he only gets a sacrifice once every four years at Olympia; or the Scythian in *Anacharsis* thinks that Greeks are too poor to give more than apples or parsley as prizes at the games.[17]

Some of the other echoes of the *Plutus* look more distinctive, but once again Lucian is only using one literary backcloth among many. Both authors make Ploutos wander round blind; but in Lucian we find Charon lost on earth, dazzled by the light; Anacharsis lost in Athens; or Menippus unable to see the earth clearly from the moon:[18] lost strangers are everywhere, and this is only one among many. But Lucian's Ploutos is lame as well as blind. He may well have drawn this detail from a reading χωλός for ψωλός at *Plut.* 267.[19] But again this is the sort of detail which appeals

[14] *LM* 188.
[15] *Plut.* 30/*Tim.* 24: cf. *J. Conf.* 16 f.; *J. Trag.* 48; *Gall.* 14.
[16] *Plut.* 210/*Tim.* 25: cf. *Icar.* 12; *Charon* 7.
[17] *Plut.* 583/*Timon* 4; *Icar.* 24; *Anach.* 9.
[18] *Timon* 24, *Charon* 1, *Scytha* 3, *Icar.* 13. See *infra* 109 ff.
[19] *Plut.* 267/*Timon* 20 (W. Süss, *RhM* 97, 1954, 143 f.).

to Lucian in any context: Hephaestus is of course a cripple, but we also find a limping lion, an old python with a walking-stick, or Lucian himself with one foot in Charon's boat.[20] And in this case he needs to make Ploutos lame to prepare for the paradox that he is slow to come and swift to go—a joke he applies just as readily to Hermes in *Kataplus*.[21]

Lucian has expanded one hint in Aristophanes into a short episode.[22] Penia had pointed out that τέχνη and σοφία would disappear if Ploutos had the use of his eyes. In Lucian's version she catches sight of Ploutos and marches her followers Ponos and Sophia from the scene. Lucian frequently withdraws his characters in this way: Orpheus hurries off to avoid Cantharus, Pan to avoid the philosophers;[23] and he will assign this sort of 'supporting cast' to any new personification—Philosophy is flanked by Eleutheria and Parrhesia; Ploutos himself is guarded by Tokos and Logismos; Aphrodite promises to bring Pothos and Hymenaeus to Paris; and even Tau has the support of Alpha and Upsilon.[24]

Lastly, Aristophanes' nouveau-riche dedicates his rags to Ploutos; Timon discovers his treasure and offers his pick and skin coat to Pan. But again Lucian is always ready with curious offerings of this kind in any context: the rustic Ganymede wants to sacrifice a goat to Zeus; Menippus promises a libation down Etna for Empedocles; or the Athenians sacrifice the most improbable white horse to the Scythian Toxaris.[25]

These parallels suggest that Lucian took from the *Plutus* only what he wanted to find. The same can be said for his use of Menander. The publication of the *Dyskolos* came just too late for Bompaire, but it has contributed nothing spectacular to the problem. There are certainly parallels,[26] and Lucian must have known the play. But he assimilates only a few incidental details which coincide with his interests elsewhere. Timon suffers from μελαγχολία, like Lucian's Peregrinus and Pythagoras.[27] Cnemon

[20] *D. Deor.* 16.1; *Philops.* 8; *ibid.* 13; *Apol.* 1.
[21] *Katapl.* 3.
[22] *Timon* 33/*Plut.* 510 ff.
[23] *Fugit.* 29; *Bis Acc.* 12.
[24] *Pisc.* 17; *Timon* 13; *Dear. Iud.* 16; *Iud. Voc.* 6.
[25] *D. Deor.* 4.2; *Icar.* 13; *Scytha* 2.
[26] V. Martin, *P. Bodmer IV*, Coligny-Geneva 1958; Wolfgang Schmidt, *RhM* 102 (1959), 157 ff.; J. Schwartz, *Biographie o.c.* 39.
[27] *Timon* 34/*Dysk.* 89/*Fugit.*; *D. Mort.* 20.4.

wants to turn his neighbours to stone, while Timon will regard other people as so many statues. But Lucian omits Menander's elaborate comparison of Cnemon to Perseus—and he has many other characters turned to stone.[28] Cnemon talks to no-one except Pan; for Timon it will be pollution to talk to anyone.[29] Again Lucian leaves out what is distinctive about Menander's version, and brings in a touch of ritual prohibition—another frequent source of fun.[30] Naturally the two misanthropes pelt all comers with clods and stones—but Lucian has dropped Menander's distinctive expression σφενδονῶν.[31]

None of these parallels within Lucian rule out direct contact between Lucian and the *Dyskolos*: I suspect on the contrary that he would have welcomed any chance to make a minimal acquaintance with Menander go a long way.[32] He could certainly have written the *Timon* as it stands without the *Dyskolos*: but on the other hand he did not have to exert himself very hard—perhaps on the most superficial acquaintance—to establish a link with the master.

It is clear, then, that Lucian can decorate any situation with 'Comic' apparatus; and because of this the *Timon* is still useless for reconstructing the intermediate progress of Timon and his legend.

Apart from *Timon*, the *Dialogi Meretricum* provide Lucian's most systematic collection of Comic themes. He compiled the whole set by manipulating 'typical' New Comic material rather than paraphrasing known plays, and this is consistent with his performance in *Timon* itself.[33] But once again there is plenty of room for other motifs. It is worthwhile to compare Corinna's situation in *D. Meretr.* 6 with a traditional apophthegm attached to Gelo's wife.[34] The latter has only slept with the tyrant and naïvely admits to him that she thought all men suffered from the same bad breath as he did; Corinna has only had one lover, and

---

[28] *Timon* 43/*Dysk.* 153/*Somnium* 14; *Vit. Auct.* 25; *D. Deor.* 14.3: cf. *Imag.* 1.

[29] *Timon* 42/*Dysk.* 10 ff. Cf. also *Bis Acc.* 11, where Pan complains about his contentious neighbours the philosophers.

[30] *VH* II.28, *Alex.* 41.

[31] *Dysk.* 120, cf. *Tim.* 34.

[32] Cf. Householder 32.

[33] Ph. Legrand, *REG* 20 (1907), 176-231; 21 (1908), 39-79.

[34] *Herm.* 34/*D. Meretr.* 6.4. Cf. Stobaeus, *Florilegium* V.83; Plut. *Mor.* 175BC (ascribed to Hiero's wife).

asks her mother if all the rest will be the same. We can suspect that Lucian was able to transfer the underlying motif from one context to the other without the help of any direct model in Comedy itself.

There are a few other situations which Legrand could not account for, and once more Lucian can be used to fill the gaps. There is no parallel from extant New Comedy for the 'Lesbian' dialogue (5), and Legrand suggested that Lucian was drawing on a pornographic tradition represented by 'Philaenis' or the Mime.[35] This would certainly account for the milieu. We are in the same world as Herondas here, but Lucian has most of the details in his repertoire. Clonarium is gradually persuading Leaena to recount how she has been seduced by a Lesbian—but the dialogue breaks off just before the one detail she really wants to know. Leaena inevitably compares her Lesbian friend to Tiresias,[36] and of course this is characteristic material of Lucian's. So is the course of the argument—in this unusual setting he displays his usual technique of keeping the dialogue from ever coming to the point, so that the inquisitive friend is still kept waiting.[37] Leaena reacts to the Lesbian's indecent overtures with the same amusing innocence as Ganymede after his capture by Zeus; [38] Clonarium presses home her questions with the same curiosity as Micyllus cross-examining Pythagoras or Menippus interviewing Tiresias about their sex lives.[39]

And at *D. Deor.* 23.2 Lucian has written a corresponding incident about a homosexual, in which Dionysus tells Apollo about Priapus' attempts to assault him.[40] Lucian is interested in any kind of sexual hybrids—Omphale dressed as Heracles, Hermaphroditus, or the wives-cum-husbands on the moon; [41] and elsewhere vinewomen try to seduce their unsuspecting victims in an unnatural sort of intercourse.[42] Here too Megilla boasts about

---

[35] Legrand *o.c.* 231. Lucian mentions Philaenis in *Pseudolog.* 24.

[36] 5.4 (Helm, *PW* 1738); cf. *D. Mort.* 28; *Gall.* 19.

[37] Cf. *Icar.* 1-3; *Conv.* 1-4; *Nigr.* 1-12.

[38] *D. Deor.* 4.

[39] *Gall.* 19/*D. Mort.* 28.

[40] The literary model for this episode is quite clearly Alcibiades' confession, Pl. *Symp.* 217C ff. Lucian may simply have wished to supply a corresponding scandal about women, without any specific literary source, except of course the traditional associations of Lesbos (cf. Bompaire 222).

[41] *Hist.* 10; *D. Deor.* 23.1, *Musc. Enc.* 12; *VH* I.22.

[42] *VH* I.8, cf. II.46.

having some kind of dildo: among Lucian's Selenites, where most things are topsy-turvy, this is the natural way.[43] This apparently unusual subject, then, has given Lucian scope for a wide range of motifs from the more risqué side of his repertoire.

In *D. Meretr.* 12.4 Pythias reconciles her companion Joessa to Lysias; he had mistaken Pythias for a man sleeping with his mistress, because of her shaved head, now concealed by a wig. There are a number of near parallels from Roman Elegy, both for the *exclusus amator* and for the mistress sleeping with another woman; [44] and examples in Comedy of the folktale theme in which a lover is deceived by a disguise.[45] The theme may also have been current in the novel: Heliodorus begins his lovers' deceptions with a sleeping person mistaken for someone else.[46] But none of these parallels accounts for the situation as a whole. Again Lucian has the opportunity to contaminate two of his own characteristic motifs against a new background. Lysias spying on Joessa and her 'lover' is yet another variation on 'immorality revealed'.[47] As for Pythias' head, Lucian describes a similar trick carried out in a very different context: Alexander of Abonoteichos deceives his worshippers in the half-light by means of a false head fitted to a snake.[48] Pythias has taken to wearing a wig after an illness; so does Lucian's Stratonice—and Alexander of Abonoteichos has one as well.[49] Moreover the whole 'plot' of this sketch has much in common with the 'Lesbian' dialogue just discussed. In both cases a bald-headed girl has been sleeping with another woman, and a third party is being too inquisitive; then Lucian manipulates the situations in two entirely different ways—Leaena tells Clonarium that the bald Megilla was only pretending to be a man; Joessa reveals to Lysias that the bald Pythias has been mistaken for one!

In *D. Meretr.* 15 two courtesans are discussing an Aetolian soldier who has gatecrashed an evening's entertainment and abused the girl who shut him out.[50] This Aetolian mysteriously

---

[43] *D. Meretr.* 5.4/*VH* I.22.

[44] Legrand *ibid.* 51 f. (Prop. II.vi.12: *et cum quae dormit amica simul*).

[45] S. Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*, Cambridge 1958, 135 f. (Plaut. *Cas.* 879 ff.: Olympio discovers that the 'bride' is really a man in disguise).

[46] I.12.

[47] *Gall.* 32, *Icar.* 15 f., *Fugit.* 30 ff. See *infra* 106 ff.

[48] *Alex.* 15 f.

[49] *pro Imag.* 5/*Alex.* 59.

[50] Legrand *o.c.* 57 f. compares Prop. IV.8: but there it is the mistress her-

becomes a Megarian in the next chapter, but there is no need to alter the text,[51] or invent a model which Lucian has carelessly adapted. In fact he allows this whimsical mixture of nationalities at *D. Meretr.* 4, where a witch is Thessalian by profession (1), but Syrian by birth (4). *Megareus* probably has some similar proverbial force,[52] and Lucian's joke is readymade. As for the gatecrashing, he uses the ἄκλητος elsewhere to turn a party into uproar by his 'military' prowess: Alcidamas breaks into a wedding in imitation of Alcibiades in Plato's *Symposium*; and Lucian works the theme on the grand scale in *Toxaris*: Arsacomas is turned down at a wedding banquet—and retaliates later with whole Scythian batallions.[53]

Few of the miniatures can be dismissed as prose paraphrases of one single source. Lucian will aim at pastiche wherever he can, even in the shortest dialogue. In *D. Meretr.* 9.4 f., the merchant Philostratus repels the braggart Polemo. Of course there is a *miles gloriosus* here in the manner of New Comedy.[54] But this is only one setting for a motif which Lucian will repeat in any other guise. Here Philostratus and Tibius prepare to repel a charlatan soldier with stones and sherds—just as Timon prepares to pelt his enemies with clods and stones: [55] Lucian will fit the same theme to New Comedy or Old. And once more we have a 'comic battle': Polemo and Parmeno prepare for an imaginary engagement, like Samippus and his three lieutenants in *Navig.* 33 ff.[56]

There is room for a similar blend in *D. Meretr.* 14.2, where the poor sailor Dorio complains to Myrtale that she despises his gifts of cheese and onions. There may be a source in New Comedy,[57] but there is also a pastoral touch in the presentation of Dorio. We should look across to *D. Mar.* 1, where Lucian is clearly paraphrasing Theocritus XI, and the more fastidious nymphs are appalled both by Polyphemus' cheese and milk and his musical exhibitions. Here Lucian has developed the scene and redistributed

self who returns to her lover's house and starts a brawl. Propertius' version however may reflect a typical kind of incident.

[51] To Μεταπεύς (Gesner) or Ἀγραεύς (Meiser).

[52] And a pun with μέγας: K. Mras suggested both, *WSt* 38 (1916), 321 and n. 1 (cf. Bompaire 704 n. 2).

[53] Pl. *Symp.* 212D/*Conv.* 11, 19; 45/*Tox.* 44-55.

[54] Legrand *REG* 21 (1908), 70.

[55] 9.5/*Timon* 34, 58.

[56] See *supra* 36 ff.

[57] Menander's *Thettale*? (Legrand *o.c.* 69).

the Cyclops' accomplishments: a poor sailor offers the humble fare, while his rival the rich merchant takes over the singing.

Often a source in Comedy will overlap with rhetorical tradition. A typical example is *D. Mort.* 12, where Hannibal and Alexander are struggling for precedence in Hades, and Scipio appears at the last moment to oppose Hannibal's claims. We can compare the battle between Aeschylus and Euripides in the *Frogs*,[58] (with Scipio as Lucian's substitute for Sophocles);[59] or Herodotus' debate between Solon and Croesus as to who has led the happiest life.[60] There is no doubt that Lucian knew both these passages—two highlights from his favourite authors[61]—but they are only part of a much larger range of converging motifs. He is particularly fond of debates about precedence—between letters, gods, or philosophers.[62] Here Alexander appears in person with Hannibal, while Scipio intervenes only at the end. This is plainly impossible in historians' versions of Scipio's meeting with Hannibal;[63] and in the *Frogs* Sophocles does not appear in person to take the chair for himself. But Lucian often introduces a surprise character as a climax to make some new revelation: in *Eunuchus* an 'anonymous' bystander confounds Bagoas' chances in his contest with Diocles, by bringing to light his enemy's past history; or in *J. Trag.* the Colossus of Rhodes arrives to claim precedence over the gods of gold who have just won their claim over the gods of stone.[64] Lucian has superimposed the same pattern here.

He can easily transfer the joke from a historical setting to a mythical one. In *D. Mort.* 16.5 Diogenes is arguing with the shade of Heracles that he must be one out of two Heracleses—but finally produces yet a third Heracles to confound his opponent.[65] Here

---

[58] So A. Thimme, *Quaestiones Lucianeae*, Diss. Göttingen 1884, 34-38; Hirzel II.319 and n. 1; P. Ledergerber, *Lukian und die altattische Komödie*, progr. Einsiedeln 1905, 49.

[59] Bompaire (253, cf. 290) objected to such parallels on purely technical grounds: the scene in *Ran.* is largely line-for-line exchange, while in *D. Mort.* 12 the characters have set speeches. But Lucian must be allowed some degree of licence when transposing Comedy into a prose medium.

[60] Helm *LM* 207.

[61] Cf. *J. Trag.* 34-53, which borrows the *mise en scène* of the debate in *Ran.*; for Croesus and Solon, *Charon* 10 ff.

[62] *Iud. Voc.*; *J. Trag.* 7-12, *D. Deor.* 13; *Eun.*

[63] Livy XXXV.14; Plut. *Pyrrh.* 8.

[64] *Eun.* 10; *J. Trag.* 11.

[65] Bompaire seems right therefore (367) to suspect a reflection of a school theme here: for other interpretations, see Helm *LM* 210 f.

Lucian blends the joke with another favourite—the god's divided identity. Trophonius has one half prophesying in Lebadeia, the other in Hades; [66] the supposedly inseparable Dioscuri are hopelessly divided at any given time; [67] Hermes himself has to divide his time between heaven and the lower world; [68] and Lucian treats Tiresias' double identity with the same contempt as Heracles'.[69]

It is tempting to account for 'Homeric' miniatures solely in terms of Homer, but several details do appear elsewhere in Lucian. The Scamander's complaint to the Sea is not merely a prose paraphrase of *Il.* XXI. 346 ff.: [70] it also gives Lucian a chance to use his favourite picture of the half-burnt figure in a Homeric setting: he applies it equally readily to Empedocles on the moon or in Hades, or to Peregrinus or Heracles.[71] Again, Achilles is made to enlarge on his classic statement about Homer's Hades.[72] He dislikes it because of its pernicious equality,[73] like Lucian's Megapenthes, the conventional tyrant of the rhetorical schools.[74] Ajax too has more to say than in Homer: [75] his companion Agamemnon transfers the blame for the contest of the arms from one character to the next—just as Aeacus delegates responsibility for the murder of Protesilaus a few dialogues previously.[76] And Ajax ends by not saying too much about Athena's part in his defeat. This is also a concluding formula in two other dialogues, where Hermes and Helios are warned not to say anything against Zeus.[77]

Two of Lucian's paraphrases are puzzling at first sight.[78] In *D. Mort.* 26 Chiron is cast as a fool who has given up his immortality for love of variety. But Lucian is merely applying the same formula as in the case of Cronos (*Sat.* 7): both gods suppress the real reason for giving up their former position: Cronos denies that he was

[66] *D. Mort.* 3.2.
[67] *D. Deor.* 26.
[68] *Katapl.* 1 f.
[69] *D. Mort.* 28.3.
[70] Bompaire 574.
[71] *Icar.* 13; *D. Deor.* 20.4; *Peregr.* 25; *D. Deor.* 13.
[72] *LM* 209.
[73] *D. Mort.* 15.2/*Od.* XI.489 ff.
[74] *Katapl.* 13, cf. 15.
[75] *Od.* XI.541 ff./*D. Mort.* 29.
[76] *D. Mort.* 19.
[77] 29.2/*D. Deor.* 21.2; 10.2.
[78] Cf. *LM* 211 f.

driven out by Zeus, while Chiron says nothing about the pain he has escaped by choosing death; and both find the most transparently sophistic excuses for enjoying their new and humbler status: Cronos can chat about old times to the Titans;[79] while Chiron rather likes the atmosphere of equality in Hades, like Lucian's Micyllus.[80] Socrates comes off little better. In *D. Mort.* 21 he turns out to have been a coward on his descent to Hades. This is no surprise either: he merely shows the same hypocrisy in the face of death as Peregrinus;[81] and Lucian has chosen here to reverse his treatment in *VH*,[82] where Socrates is even more courageous after death than at Delium.

A few other cross-references have still to be noted. In *D. Deor.* 8 Athena dances the Pyrrhic war-dance the moment she has sprung from the head of Zeus. Lucian could be drawing on a Comedy (Hermippus' Ἀθηνᾶς Γοναί),[83] or more likely the classic passages on dancing in Plato's *Laws*;[84] but there are similar humorous touches elsewhere. Against a Hellenistic setting Lucian's Zeus skips on the beach while disguised as Europa's white bull; or Silenus dances the *kordax* in India or heaven.[85] Nor is it clear that Lucian is using a Comic source for *D. Deor.* 24,[86] where Hermes complains to Maia about his chores. The ethos might as easily be Hellenistic, as in the doublet in *D. Deor.*,[87] where Eros is at odds with Aphrodite. And the complaints Hermes uses here are only the commonplace arguments against Providence: they appear as 'Epicurean' in the mouth of Zeus in *Bis Accusatus*.[88] There may be a Hellenistic model behind *D. Deor.* 25, where Zeus quarrels with Helios over Phaethon. But Lucian's version develops quite differently from the scene in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* cited by Helm,[89] and the story of Phaethon was well embedded in rhetorical tradition.[90] Moreover

---

[79] Cf. Hermes, *Charon* 1; Socrates, *D. Mort.* 20.6, *VH* II.23.
[80] *Katapl.* 15.
[81] *Peregr.* 33 cf. 44.
[82] II.23.
[83] Kock I.224 (Boldermann, *Quaestiones Lucianeae*, Diss. Leyden 1893, 76).
[84] *Legg.* VII.796B, 816B (M. Kokolakis, ΠΛΑΤΩΝ 11, 1959, 22). And *de Saltatione* 34 shows a knowledge of *Legg.* 814D-816D (Householder 35).
[85] *D. Mar.* 15.2; *Bacch.* 1, *Icar.* 27.
[86] Helm *PW* 1737.
[87] *D. Deor.* 12.
[88] *Bis Acc.* 1-3 (cf. Saturn's resignation because of overwork, *Sat.* 7).
[89] *Met.* II.130 ff.
[90] The authors of *de Astrologia* and *de Saltatione*, whether Lucian or not,

both parts of the dialogue have doublets elsewhere in the series: Zeus gives prosaic instructions for Phaethon's memorial, as Poseidon does for Helle's;[91] and we have two gods quarreling about the repair of Phaethon's chariot, like Hermes and Charon over Charon's boat.[92] Little is certain about the miniatures, except that Lucian will never miss the opportunity to use any amusing detail over again.

Because these pieces are so individual, it is always tempting to invoke outré sources. Lucian makes Dialogue complain that he has given her a προσωπεῖον . . . κωμικὸν δὲ καὶ σατυρικὸν . . . καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν γελοῖον.[93] Several scholars have interpreted this as a claim that Lucian used Satyric Drama itself, and set out to find specific sources. But there is no evidence that it was popular in the second century.[94] Bompaire however argued that the miniature dialogues originated as 'transpositions' of Satyric Drama—small prose reductions of a dramatic form.[95] But guesses from the mere titles of lost plays are of little use here. It is true that the two miniatures which correspond to such titles (*D. Mar.* 6/Aeschylus' *Amymone*; *D. Deor.* 20/Sophocles' *Krisis*) can be divided into several brief scenes, whereas most of the rest cannot. But Lucian's method of marking off the scenes is to include a brief imaginary journey; and this technique appears just as readily in some of the most ambitious 'Menippean' pieces,[96] so that it cannot necessarily be used as evidence of direct borrowing from a drama. And whatever the source, there is the usual assimilation of themes: the scene between Amymone and Poseidon is similar to the impasse between Ganymede and Zeus in *D. Deorum*;[97] while the *Dearum Iudicium* is yet another debate on precedence like the contest between Alexander, Scipio and Hannibal, or the *syncrisis* between Hera and Leto.[98] Nor are the personnel of Satyric Drama very prominent.[99] Lucian does use Pan and Silenus,[100] but only in a

include it in their reviews of the most popular mythology (*Astr.* 19, *Salt.* 55). Lucian himself uses it in a rhetorical *prolalia*, *Electr.* 1.

[91] 29.2/*D. Mar.* 9.1.

[92] *D. Mort.* 4.

[93] *Bis Acc.* 33.

[94] Householder 59 f. (despite Schmid-Christ[6] I.ii.84 n. 5).

[95] 568.

[96] *Pisc.*, *Bis Acc.*, *Fugit.*

[97] 6.3, *D. Deor.* 4.

[98] *D. Deor.* 20/*D. Mort.* 12; *D. Deor.* 16.

[99] Helm *LM* 181.

[100] *D. Deor.* 22, *Bis Acc.* 9 ff.; *Bacch.* 1, *Icar.* 27.

very limited way; Dionysus himself appears in only a small number of miniatures,[101] and in any case he was easily available from Lucian's most basic reading.[102] Pan and the Satyrs were equally in place even in the contemporary novel; [103] nor does Lucian ever make use of a chorus of Satyrs. On present evidence it is clear that Satyric Drama could only have contributed a few themes out of many; and there is nothing to show that its contribution was distinctive.[104]

The σατυρικόν of *Bis Acc.* 33 can be explained more simply. Lucian juxtaposes the term not only to κωμικόν but to γελοῖον. and contrasts both of them with σωφρονικόν as well as τραγικόν. In these circumstances the word need not denote a literary genre at all; it could equally well be a clever half-truth on Lucian's part, merely exploiting the fact that he introduces Pan and Dionysus from time to time.

---

[101] *D. Deor.* 9, 18, 23 (other references are only incidental).

[102] Ar. *Ran.*; Eur. *Bacch.* (*Adv. Ind.* 19).

[103] Longus II.26.

[104] B. McCarthy (*YCS* 4, 1934, 54) suggested a Satyric Drama as a model for *Vitarum Auctio*: Euripides *Syleus* (Nauck 689 ff.) included a sale of Heracles by Zeus and Hermes. But since they officiate together all over Lucian's major dialogues, there could scarcely be a more natural choice to auction so many eminent philosophers. Helm (*LM* 227-53) offered Menippus' Διογένους πρᾶσις as his source; and in this case a cross-reference within Lucian suggests that he was right. The interview with Diogenes in *Vit. Auct.* contains nothing that can positively be ascribed to Menippus' work from the report in Diogenes Laertius (VI.29 cf. 74). But Lucian does put the philosopher Timocles into a situation where he is both auctioned *and* captured and sold by pirates (*Merc. Cond.* 23, 24). Menippus would be the natural source for this juxtaposition of themes. But of course Lucian could still be using more than one literary source: a much more likely one than the *Syleus* would be the Myth of Er, which he recalls so often elsewhere: at 618A a crier arranges the newly-arrived souls.

CHAPTER SEVEN

DRAMA II: FOUR CHARACTERISTIC SITUATIONS

In Lucian's blend of Dialogue and Comedy his debts to both Plato and Aristophanes are usually clear: but there are other elements here besides 'Platonic' appeals to friendship,[1] or driving Old Comic pretenders off the stage. Lucian has a small but versatile collection of dramatic motifs, which he can attach to any of his usual models in turn. It is not always possible to give them any one specific origin, but they still have to be recognised as part of Lucian's literary vocabulary, and throw light on several familiar problems at the same time.

(a) *Interrupting a flight of fancy*

Lucian often makes his interlocutor discover a friend in the middle of some exotic reverie, and takes some time to bring him down to earth. It is *de rigueur* to introduce a reminiscence of Socrates rapt in meditation,[2] but he has systematically worked this same situation into most of his other literary idioms as well. It gives him an opportunity to make the 'inspired' actor's speech completely at variance with his setting: Lexiphanes mouths his account of a 'Platonic' symposium, but in ridiculous Hyperattic language, until Lycinus can stand no more of it; [3] Timon makes a long rhetorical tirade in prose, in a setting which belongs to Old Comedy, until Zeus is finally forced to settle with him; [4] Menippus, re-enacting the role of Trygaeus,[5] bewilders his friend with a flood of astronomical calculations; [6] or Zeus, Hermes and Athena declaim in a pastiche of Homer, Comedy and Euripides until the prosaic Hera becomes exasperated.[7] When these situations are placed side by side, they help us to clarify two others. At

[1] Bompaire 312.
[2] Pl. *Symp.* 174D,cf. *Herm.* 1.
[3] *Lex.* 1-16.
[4] *Timon* 1-7.
[5] Ar. *Pax* 819 ff.
[6] *Icar.* 1.
[7] *J. Trag.* 1-3.

Neky. 1 Menippus is discovered mouthing verses of Euripides, and a puzzled friend has to ask him to stop. Now Menippus himself may have caricatured a mouther of verses.[8] But if he did, it was only part of a much larger convergence of themes reflected in Lucian's version. The latter's Menippus had dressed like Heracles for his trip to Hades, a direct adaptation of the *Frogs*; and already in Aristophanes' version Dionysus quotes Euripides, to Heracles' disgust.[9] Lucian also knew Plato's *Phaedrus*, where Socrates twice checks himself after his inspiration has driven him into dithyramb, tragedy and Epic.[10]

Again, at *Nigrinus* 1-12 Lucian himself, newly 'converted' to philosophy, mouths an unlikely sequence of rhetorical similes, culminating in the inevitable 'tragic actor' (8 ff.),[11] once more to his listener's dismay. Scholars have persisted in finding ingenious reasons to 'explain' why he should caricature himself in this way at such length;[12] but alongside the other examples it is clear that he is simply fitting this topos into his own biography—with copious allusion once more to the *Phaedrus*.[13] He is determined to exploit his opportunity to the full, and if this leads to a difficult join with the rest of the dialogue, then he is content to sacrifice the whole for the part.

(b) *Countering a proclamation*

Lucian frequently contrives situations where one of his characters brings about a dramatic turning-point in the 'plot' by emending a proclamation. Scholars have already paid attention to Lucian's use of parody decrees;[14] this way of presenting them should be seen as a motif in its own right. He will make Syllogism serve a summons on the false philosophers; but they do not appear until Parrhesiades takes over and announces a distribution of doles. Or Hermes will issue a description of a runaway slave, but only when a slaveowner corrects it does Orpheus appear *ex machina*

---

[8] As suggested by P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge 1970, 47 f., who compares Eumolpus' pitiful recitations in *Satyricon* 90.

[9] *Ran.* 38 ff., 100 ff.

[10] 238D, 241E.

[11] For Lucian's parody of rhetorical similes, see *infra* 174 ff.

[12] For the theories that Lucian is introducing a 'diversion' from his real 'intentions', see Bompaire 510 f. and notes.

[13] *Nigr.* 7/255D; 9-11/228AB, 236D.

[14] Bompaire 637 ff.

to give the man's whereabouts.[15] In *J. Trag.* alone there are no fewer than three separate instances: Hermes opens the heavenly council in prose, and there is no response until he repeats the summons in hexameters; or in reverse, Zeus wants to make an announcement in Homeric style, but Hermes insists that he use tags from Demosthenes; while Hermes Agoraeus breaks off his iambics to deliver his speech in more informative prose.[16] In *Timon* Lucian has to modify the topos slightly: the misanthrope has set up his own decree, but of course there is no audience present to propose amendments; here Timon himself has to introduce an exception to his own laws (45). The situation in *Charon* is equally contrived: this time the ferryman recites to Hermes a proclamation he intends to make; but his guide points out how futile it will be and he withdraws it altogether (20). Nor does Lucian confine his topos to law-givings, assemblies, or public announcements: Hermes offers to give Charon a good view of the world: but his first formula from Homer only does half the task, and he needs a second one to give Charon the necessary sharp sight;[17] Micyllus 'corrects' the song of the souls who cross the Styx with a parodic lament of his own; and the dead son answers back from Hades against his own father's mourning;[18] while in a 'Platonic' symposium the grammarian Histiaeus rivals the philosopher Ion's outrageous toast to the bride with an even worse one of his own.[19] It is no surprise to see the theme also appearing as a realistic event: in *Peregrinus* Lucian's 'stranger' challenges Theagenes' oracle with an irreverent counter-oracle of his own.[20]

The previous formula gave Lucian the chance to fuse his literary sources in the most incongruous way; this one gives him a convenient way to combine both parody and antithesis. There is no way of deciding his exact starting-point. He clearly knew Dionysus' answer to the frogs' rowing-song, and Socrates' reply

---

15 *Pisc.* 40 ff.; *Fugit.* 27 ff.

16 *J. Trag.* 6 f.; 14 f.; 33. These last examples overlap with the previous formula. Again Hermes is forced to abandon his extravagant versifying in favour of prose, as Zeus does in *J. Trag.* 15.

17 *Charon* 4-7. This example should perhaps also be related to the 'sorcerer's apprentice' formula, as in *Philops.* 35 f.: the first magic line only achieves half the required effect.

18 *Katapl.* 20; *Luct.* 13, 16 ff.

19 *Conv.* 39 ff.

20 *Peregr.* 29 f.

both to 'Lysias' ' speech and his own revision of it.[21] Or this motif could be yet another device for introducing a rhetorical *syncrisis*: Maximus of Tyre [22] gives Socrates a 'counter-accusation' against the Athenians; Philostratus gives one orator an unjust motion in favour of Aristides, before another 'corrects' it with a just one; [23] and the *progymnasmata* [24] sometimes include refutation of a law as a rhetorical exercise. Some situation in Menippus might also have converged with all these to encourage Lucian: but he has exploited enough permutations to make the theme a characteristic part of his own equipment.

(c) *Exposing charlatans*

This is any satirist's professional task: but Lucian is often more interested in the means than in the end. There is one basic motif: his 'hero' can enlist some faithful friend, surprise witness, or novel device to help him reveal some new and unspeakable crime. Micyllus uses the cock and his magic feather to reveal the miseries of the rich; Lycinus discovers the philosophers' worst crimes by the sudden light of a lamp; or Justice hears reports about them from her brother Hermes, and is about to hear more from Pan, who spies on their night-life from his post on the Acropolis.[25] Again the motif belongs to all his usual sources: *alazones* are exposed in Old Comedy in the scenes after the parabasis; [26] the wicked are revealed in the trial scenes of Platonic Myth; [27] the *kataskopos* is a Cynic cliché embedded in rhetorical tradition; [28] school declamation thrives on such themes as the adulterer unmasked [29]—and Lucian is not at a loss for precedents even in Homer.[30] He has produced so many versions that this motif tends to occupy its own special point in the structure of many dialogues. And his ingenuity with the formula is clear from the cases where a dramatic motif reappears in some unlikely 'philological' setting. In a trial-scene set in Hades, Cyniscus summons a tyrant's bed

[21] Ar. *Ran.* 236 ff./*Katapl.* 20; Pl. *Phaedr.* 237 ff., 243 ff./*de Domo* 4.
[22] *Or.* III.vi.H.
[23] *VA* VI.21.
[24] Theon, Spengel II. p. 69.
[25] *Gall* 28 ff.; *Conv.* 46; *Bis Acc.* 8 ff.
[26] Cf. *Timon* 45 ff.
[27] E.g. *Gorgias* 524C/*Katapl.* 23 ff.
[28] *Icar.* 15 ff./Helm *LM* 90 f.
[29] Philostr. *VS* 542.
[30] *D. Deor.* 17/*Od.* VIII.266 ff.

and lamp to testify to his debauches; while in a routine invective, Lucian himself summons the false rhetor's tongue and beard, to inform on his debauches and solecisms at once![31] There is a similar doublet in *Fugitivi* and *Iudicium Vocalium*: [32] a man arrives with a slave-owner at a house in Thrace to find a slave who has abducted his wife; then again in philological guise, Sigma arrives with Rho at a house in Cybelus to find that Tau has plagiarised and stolen all his household goods. The final scenes of *Piscator* and *Lexiphanes* offer a still closer doublet: Lycinus comes to Philosophy's rescue with a fishing rod to haul up false philosopher-fish from below the Acropolis; and Sopolis comes to Lycinus' rescue with an emetic to haul up Hyperattic words from Lexiphanes' throat.[33]

This motif will appear at every opportunity, and we can use it to throw light on the controversial episode at *Timon* 39 ff., where the misanthrope discovers treasure which will make him the envy of his former flatterers. Here scholars have felt obliged to invoke every missing link in the tradition as Lucian's source—a Comic theme,[34] a biography of Timon,[35] or even popular influence on a comic original [36]—while others assume that the episode is his own invention.[37] The rest of Lucian is the only real clue. The motif itself is an integral part of his repertoire,[38] especially in 'Cynicising' passages on the vanity of human wishes: Adimantus wishes for treasure, Micyllus dreams of it.[39] The innovation here is that although Timon has the sense not to want it, he still has to accept it: by this presentation, Lucian fuses the scene with the topos *si quis deus*—if a god grants something, the recipient will not want it.[40] But here the treasure also serves another purpose: it is the fantastic device which Lucian so frequently uses to bring about his scenes of exposure: Micyllus was given a magic feather,

[31] *Katapl.* 25 ff.; *Pseudolog.* 25 f.

[32] *Fugit.* 24-33/*Iud. Voc.* 7.

[33] *Pisc.* 47 ff./*Lex.* 20 f.

[34] Bompaire 173; F. Bertram, *Die Timonlegende*, Diss. Heidelberg, 1906, 61 ff. (Menander's *Hydria*); cf. Ledergerber 32 (Ar. *Pax*?); Helm, *LM* 187 n. 2.

[35] F. Leo, *griech.-röm. Biographie*, Leipzig 1901, 116 f.

[36] Cf. Meyer, *Laudes Inopiae*, Diss. Fribourg 1915, 82 (Bursian 211, 1927, 74).

[37] Hirzel II.300; Piccolomini, *Studi di filologia greca* I (1882), 313 f., and Mesk, *RhM* 70 (1915), 137 f. are neutral.

[38] As Mesk points out, *ibid.* 127.

[39] *Navig.* 20; *Gall.* 12.

[40] Cf. Hor. *Sat.* II.vi.10-13 (Silk, *YCS* 19, 1966, 234-51).

Hermes a magic formula to give him a view of impostors in action;[41] and Parrhesiades invents a fictitious treasure to attract greedy philosophers, then improvises a prize to hook a few of them.[42] In the same way Timon uses his new-found treasure to bring back his flatterers. This kind of similarity makes it futile to speculate that Lucian derived the motif from any one specific source connected with the Timon tradition: instead he has taken an opportunity to vary a favourite motif and a favourite scene. The treasure also serves as part of Lucian's attack on Providence: in effect Zeus is unable to administer justice properly, and has been forced to buy Timon off.[43]

The exposure scene at *Fugitivi* 26-33 has proved equally controversial because of its obscurity: Philosophy and Hermes have arrived in Thrace in search of immoral philosophers, and meet a husband in search of his kidnapped wife, and three masters in search of runaway slaves; outside the hideout they overhear the woman chanting oracular verses: the philosophers are unmasked as the ex-slaves Cantharus, Lekythion and Myropnous; and after laborious puns on their misdeeds Hermes dispenses punishments. Scholars have attempted to explain various aspects of this clumsily contrived scene—as burlesque of a tragic ending,[44] a personal pamphlet against 'Cantharus',[45] a Comic pastiche,[46] a 'Menippean' episode,[47] or an extract from Ariston of Chios.[48] But none of these suggestions will account for this accumulation of eccentricities. It is at least reasonable to suppose that Lucian was writing an occasional piece for delivery in Thrace: otherwise Hermes' compliment to Philippopolis is pointless (25). In these circumstances he had every incentive to include as much of his stock as he could for what might possibly be no more than a single hearing. Cantharus is foul-mouthed and should be avoided, like Timon;[49] a man's wife is discovered with a slave, like Eucrates' wife in *Gall.*;[50]

---

41 *Gall.* 28 *supra*, *Charon* 7 ff.
42 *Pisc.* 41, 47 ff.
43 *Supra* 83 ff.
44 Bompaire 606 n. 1.
45 Fritzsche *ad loc.* (II.ii.238) cf. Hirzel II.309.
46 Hirzel II. 310 n. 1 (Eupolis' Δραπέται, Cratinus Δραπέτιδες).
47 Helm *LM* 317.
48 J. Geffcken *NJklAlt* 37 (1911), 482; *contra*, W. Capelle *BPhW* 34 (1914), 273.
49 *Fugit.* 29/*Tim.* 6 f.
50 *Fugit.* 30/*Gall.* 32 (cf. *Alex.* 50, *infra* p. 126).

and the whole affair is brought to light by means of oracular verses, as in one of the oracles of Alexander of Abonoteichos.[51] The slave is also a philosopher who has changed his school, like Peregrinus,[52] and even his name, like the upstart Simon in *Gall.*;[53] he is also a runaway philosopher-slave to be handed back to his master, like the Sceptic Pyrrhias in *Vit. Auct.*;[54] and he has two companions, so that Lucian has an opportunity for puns on *Trikaranos* and *Triphales*, like the jokes in *Pseudologista*,[55] or an allusion to Geryon, as in the tale of three friends in *Toxaris*.[56] He has accordingly produced a scene which 'has everything'—except cohesion.[57]

(d) *Meeting a stranger*

Lucian frequently resorts to a much more ambitious formula—or rather a series of separate ones—which overlap the three just mentioned: 'a traveller surprises his interlocutor with some strange disguise. At first one of them mistakes the other's identity, but they turn out to have some kind of kinship. After a brief literary game one of them makes a fantastic revelation'. Even for this rather complicated sequence Lucian did not have very far to look. In the opening scene of the *Frogs* Dionysus surprises Heracles with his exotic disguise for going down to Hades; they engage in discussion about the merits of tragedians; and Dionysus finally obtains information about the way down.[58] But the formula may also have been accessible through sophistic literature, as suggested by the setting of Philostratus' *Heroicus*. A traveller in unfamiliar (Phoenician) costume meets a vinedresser; after a literary game with Homeric allusions, the stranger finds that his humble host has even studied philosophy and is therefore a kindred spirit—who goes on to give him amazing revelations, by reporting his conversations with the ghosts of heroes at Troy.[59]

Lucian's own versions of this unwieldy formula are surprisingly

---

51 *Fugit.* 30/*Alex.* 50.
52 *Fugit.* 31/*Peregr.* 11, 17.
53 *Fugit.* 28/*Gall.* 14.
54 *Fugit.* 33/*Vit Auct.* 27.
55 *Fugit.* 32/*Pseudolog.* 29.
56 *Fugit.* 31/*Tox.* 62, *Herm.* 74.
57 For Cantharus' other stereotyped features, see *supra* 70.
58 *Ran.* 38 ff. Lucian imitates the passage directly at *Neky.* 1.
59 For Lucian's treatment compared to Ph.'s, *infra* 169 ff.

consistent, and account for some of his most characteristic episodes: in *Icar.* 13 f. Empedocles startles the celestial traveller Menippus with his disguise as a burnt cinder, so that the latter mistakes him for a moon-spirit. But he proves to be a fellow-mortal after all—with an appropriate Homeric tag, and gives Menippus a new keenness of vision for looking down at the earth. There is a similar version in *J. Trag.* 33, where Hermes Agoraeus travels up to heaven covered in pitch. Zeus sees through the disguise and realises that he is the brother of Hermes in heaven; after a flourish of tragic messenger speech the stranger gives the gods vital news of the conspiracy on earth, so that they can now roll back the clouds and spy on what is afoot.

By using this formula at the opening of a dialogue, Lucian can modulate from some kind of absurd surprise into his moral message. We can look at the openings of *Charon*, *Nekyomanteia*, *Gallus* and *Piscator* side by side. Charon surprises Hermes by appearing on earth; Menippus startles a friend with his curious costume when he arrives back from Hades; a horde of philosophers obtain leave from Hades and surprise Parrhesiades with their hostility; or a cock surprises Micyllus by talking and claiming to be Pythagoras. Soon we have old friends all round: Charon and Hermes are old workmates; Menippus is the familiar Cynic despite his disguise; Parrhesiades and the philosophers turn out to be on the same side against false philosophers; and Micyllus has known the cock a long time.[60] All parties now engage in games of verse—Charon and Hermes try their hand at Homeric cento; Menippus is carried away in a flourish of Homeric and Tragic tags; the philosophers take on Parrhesiades line by line; and the cock can quote Pindar on request.[61] Then the fantastic revelation: Hermes shows Charon the earth, Menippus reports urgent news from the underworld, Parrhesiades exposes the false philosophers; and the cock shows Micyllus the miseries of wealth.[62]

These situations are both artificial and fantastic. But Lucian can manipulate all the details into some less spectacular contexts: within the restricted compass of a miniature dialogue (*D. Deor.* 22), Pan has arrived from Arcadia and startles Hermes by claiming to be his son—in spite of his disguise as a goat. He too is not

---

[60] *Charon* 2; *Neky.* 1; *Pisc.* 5.; *Gall.* 20.
[61] *Charon passim*; *Neky.* 1; *Pisc.* 3; *Gall* 7.
[62] *Charon* 4 ff.; *Neky.* 2; *Pisc.* 29 ff.; *Gall.* 28 ff.

without artistic talents; and he certainly has some surprise revelations to make to his long-lost father—from his mother.

He can also adapt the formula to the conventions of Platonic dialogue in *Nigrinus* or *Imagines*. Lucian has just returned from Rome; Lycinus has just come back from a procession. In a Platonic setting there is no room for fantastic disguise: instead Lucian surprises his friend with his new aloofness, while Lycinus claims to be turned to stone, and by a woman instead of a boy.[63] Both of them reluctantly agree to oblige their hearers. Then a 'cultural' interlude:[64] Lucian indulges in elaborate rhetorical flourishes, while Lycinus has a long conversation about Old Masters. And finally the revelations:[65] Lucian presents Nigrinus' speech as a fantastic spiritual experience; Lycinus puts the pictures together to form an amazing portrait of Panthea.

Even in his 'biography' of Alexander of Abonoteichos Lucian selects information which falls into the pattern: Alexander amazes the Paphlagonians by arriving from Greece dressed in exotic costume; although they know he is one of themselves, they still mistake him for a descendent of Perseus. He has a repertoire of oracles (instead of verse quotations), and makes a miraculous revelation by uncovering the god Glycon (*Alex.* 11-13).

These variations, widely different among themselves, still show how stereotyped Lucian's situations tend to become. It is against this same pattern that we should reconsider the long-standing problem of *Icar.* 22 f. This passage has long been cited as one of the clearest instances of what Lucian must have taken from Menippus:[66] the link is a similar passage in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, a satire written in an unequivocal mixture of prose and verse, automatically linked to the label 'Menippean Satire'.[67]

---

[63] *Nigr.* 1/*Imag.* 1.

[64] *Nigr.* 6 ff./*Imag.* 4.

[65] *Nigr.* 12 ff./*Imag.* 6 ff.

[66] See Helm *LM* 107 ff., followed by O. Weinreich, *Senecae Apocolocyntosis*, Berlin 1923, 68 ff., and Hall (92): contra, A. P. Ball, Commentary, Columbia 1902 *ad loc.*, Bompaire 553 and C. F. Russo, Florence 1970 *ad loc.*, who accept community of ideas.

[67] J. Schwartz, *RHPhR* 49 (1969), 135 f. links *Icar.* 22 with the *Gedullat Moses* and the *Apocalypse of Baruch*. His parallels include the fact that the inhabitants of heaven are in fear and trembling at Menippus' arrival. But this is a typical Lucianic joke—repeated in Hades (*Neky.* 10); and Lucian's Olympians are natural cowards in most situations. Menippus is also afraid, like Dionysus in a similar disguise in Ar. *Ran.* 460 ff. Schwartz' other parallels are equally banal—no second century rhetor needed to go to Jewish sources

In *Apocolocyntosis* 5 Claudius arrives in heaven, looking like neither god nor man and bellowing like a sea monster. Heracles adopts a tragic pose and asks τίς πόθεν εἷς ἀνδρῶν, πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες; to which Claudius offers another Homeric reply. Eventually he identifies himself and claims kinship with the gods. This is a fair approximation to the formula just discussed. So too is Lucian's version in *Icar.* 22: Menippus arrives in heaven, disguised as part eagle, part vulture; the gods mistake him on arrival for the first of an invasion, though his eagle part is on good terms with Zeus; this time Zeus himself asks τίς πόθεν κ.τ.λ., and Menippus delivers a despatch from the moon, with news of the philosophers. It is not enough to assume that one joke about the ancient equivalent of 'St. Peter at the Gate' is bound to be much the same as another. A common 'Menippean' tradition cannot be entirely ruled out. But on the other hand Seneca was the writer of a *Hercules Furens*, so that he scarcely needed Menippus to supply him with *Tum Hercules tragicus fit et ait.* He himself stresses that τίς πόθεν κ.τ.λ. is only *quod facillimum fuit Graeculo*; and he is of course committed by the subject itself to lampoon Claudius' appearance and apotheosis, so that disguise and arrival in heaven are inevitable. We may also remember that if Seneca's frivolous reading stretched to 'Menippean Satire', then it may also have stretched to the passage of Aristophanes' *Peace*[68] which Lucian certainly used in his version. But whatever the role of Menippus, Seneca's passage was bound to coincide for several reasons with parts of Lucian's formula; and of course Lucian follows it out as usual. He had no reason to avoid imitating Menippus, but there is certainly nothing here that he could not have supplied from elsewhere—except the name Menippus!

In his use of dramatic clichés, then, Lucian shows himself at his most versatile, although the number of formulae he develops is very limited: this will become still more apparent when we come to consider the structure of whole dialogues.

---

for a conventional ἐκ περιωπῆς. But Schwartz' basic assumption is wrong: would Lucian's audience be able to recognise any of this literature?

[68] 177 ff.

CHAPTER EIGHT

LEARNING AND MOCK-LEARNING

The second-century sophists thrived on the most superficial and derivative culture, as a glance at Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* will show. Lucian was one cultural opportunist among many, and he could play games with a wide range of learned and serious subjects. But many of his 'erudite' excursions still betray his favourite motifs and preoccupations. Before we invent treatises for him to consult, we have to be satisfied that he did not already have his information to hand.

Sometimes his pretensions can be misleading. He opens the *Philopseudes* with a miniature debate on why men should tell lies, before going on to retell a series of trivial tales. Is he then setting out to portray the religious psychology of the educated classes? For Caster the tales 'deviennent des instruments d'analyse psychologique, et à propos de chacune d'elles nous savons quel est le problème qui préoccupe Lucien: 'Comment se fait-il' dit Tychiades, 'que certains hommes aiment le mensonge?' [1] But Lucian is interested in no such 'problem'. Apart from ruling out lies told for convenience, he never comes round to finding reasons for superstition at all; and the tales give him the opportunity not only to embellish familiar motifs, but to attack philosophers from yet another angle. Lucian's 'problem' turns out to be merely the *spoudaion* before the *geloion*. More important: even Theophrastus had posed it in almost the same terms in his character-sketch of the *deisidaimon*.[2]

Scholars can be equally credulous when Lucian claims to be 'selecting' information. He would have us believe that he has countless instances at his fingertips from poets, historians and philosophers—for the correct way to say 'good morning'; [3] and good classical authority for the word ἀποφράς—which he then

---

[1] *Pensée* 323.

[2] *Char*. XVI.

[3] *pro Lapsu* 7. Gerhard accepts the claim at its face value (*Ph N.F.* 18, 1905, 49 n. 67, cf. Bompaire 394 and n. 1).

declines to produce, because his enemy is too ignorant to appreciate it! [4]

But sweeping claims of this sort come easily to Lucian in any context: in *Toxaris* Mnesippus claims as a matter of course that the tall stories he has selected about Greek friends are only a few out of many, and the first that sprang to mind; and Lucian claims that he has only reported a random part of his conversation with Nigrinus.[5] In none of these cases do we need to give him the benefit of the doubt; such claims can just as easily suggest that he has now come to the end of the information that is readily available, but has not taken the trouble to stretch beyond his modest resources.

Lucian's discussion of *paideia* itself is revealing. In *Anacharsis* he includes a little dialogue on Athenian education in his *gymnasticus* between Solon and Anacharsis (20-30). But what standpoint does Lucian take, and how is the dialogue related to the rest of his work? Is Anacharsis the Cynic mouthpiece against the system [6]—or is Solon the Cynic himself, as he is in *Charon*? [7] Or is the argument merely an exercise in Platonic dialogue where characterisation is less important? [8] Most critics agree that Lucian has brought the argument to a neutral conclusion, contrary to expectation.[9] But he has also assembled a number of clichés which appear in less ambiguous guises elsewhere; it is these that will show where his own sympathies lie, and how consistently he maintains them.

In effect he has pieced together Solon's culture from his own special dislikes. The young are taught tales from Homer and Hesiod (21), when Lucian elsewhere follows Plato in disapproving of their more ridiculous stories.[10] As a result Solon's boast has an ironic ring: the boys hear about feats of valour and celebrated deeds, and are gradually roused to imitate them in order to be

---

[4] *Pseudolog.* 15, accepted by Baldwin (*CR N.S.* 12, 1962, 3).
[5] *Tox.* 35; *Nigr.* 35.
[6] R. Heinze, *Ph* 50 (1891), 460 f., cf. Bompaire 356, 678.
[7] Helm *NJKlAlt* 9 (1902), 366; so Sinko, *Eos* 14 (1908), 135.
[8] W. H. Tackaberry, *Lucian's relationship with Plato and the post-Aristotelian philosophers, University of Toronto Studies, Philological Series* 9 (1930) 37; cf. Croiset 50.
[9] Hirzel II.285; Helm *ibid.* 366 f.; Müller, *Eos* 32 (1930), 580; Bompaire 355.
[10] *Sacr.* 8; *Philops.* 2.

celebrated in turn by posterity. They are next entrusted to philosophers and sophists (22), both favourite butts,[11] and then to Tragedy, which in Lucian's eyes represents all that is artificial or pretentious.[12] Moreover the real reward for athletic prowess turns out to be the favour of the crowd and public recognition—ambitions which Lucian condemns as the height of arrogance, both in his 'Cynic' pieces and in his most virulent pamphlets.[13]

Solon is also caught out on a number of minor points: his involved rhetorical simile (35), which Anacharsis cannot understand, is really a joke against Athenian education, since it shows up the wisest man in Athens as a glib but unconvincing sophist.[14] Lucian has similar fun when his other Scythian Toxaris condemns Greek rhetoric, or when a friend exposes (Lucian's) own rhetorical tricks in *Nigrinus*.[15] And Solon is finally forced to justify athletics by comparing it with cock-fighting (37)! Bompaire would put this down to Lucian's extreme loyalty to tradition (355), but it only exposes Solon's sheer sophistry still further. The sage is then forced to defend Spartan whippings, not because he approves or understands them, but because they are Greek (38):[16] Anacharsis has to ask whether Lycurgus himself ever submitted to such training! Solon also commends the honours paid to statues—another topic on which Lucian has constant reservations.[17] And Anacharsis (39) recommends hellebore for the Spartans—a remedy which Lucian only prescribes against out-and-out fools.[18]

Finally Solon has to refer his guest to the Spartans, and changes the subject to Scythian customs (40): he is still not convinced that he has lost the argument, and cannot see that every round has gone to Anacharsis. In this respect he is like Lucian's stupid Stoic Timocles (*J. Trag.* 51 ff.), who cannot see how or why he is being defeated. Anacharsis on the other hand can afford to be ironic, pretending that the Scythians are cowards and that he will need to 'rehearse' his defence of their customs. It is quite clear

---

[11] *Herm.* 81; *Eun.* 8-9; *Rh. Pr. passim.*
[12] *Icar.* 29; *Neky.* 16; *Hist.* 1 (and numerous other examples).
[13] E.g. *Gall.* 14, 24; *Katapl.* 14; *Peregr.* and *Rh. Pr. passim.*
[14] Cf. *supra* 82.
[15] *Tox.* 9, 38; *Nigr.* 8, 10, 12.
[16] *Contra* Müller, *Eos* 32 (1930), 580.
[17] *Philops.* 19 ff.; cf. *Gall.* 24; *pro Imag.* 11.
[18] Chrysippus, *VH* II.18; Alexander, *D. Mort.* 13.6; cf. Hermotimus, *Herm.* 86.

that Lucian has maintained his usual 'Cynic' view of athletics, and included an ironic attack on many more of his favourite themes. And at the same time he has manipulated the character of Solon: in *Charon* he was cast as the sensible Cynic, whereas here he is caught by the same argument as he uses to trap Croesus: what use are the Lydian's gold ingots—or the Greeks' apples and parsley—in a real invasion? [19]

If *Paideia* itself can be an object of fun, what about the individual branches of learning? Lucian has much the same approach to history in *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit.* His shortcomings as a historical critic have long been apparent; [20] but how did he arrive at the views he holds, and why should he of all people have written a treatise on historiography at all? Did he merely draw on recollections of his rhetorical training,[21] or did he have a single specific source? [22] Or was he at least working within the framework of Peripatetic tradition? [23] The combined researches of Avenarius and Homeyer offer a wide range of possibilities, and there is no accounting for the role of lost works such as the Πῶς κρινοῦμεν τὴν ἀληθῆ ἱστορίαν attributed to Plutarch (Lamprias 124). But we have already seen that the first half of Lucian's essay is rich in cross-references,[24] and the same test can be applied here.

Lucian's reason for writing is significant: he is going to join in when all the world is writing; but he wrote *Verae Historiae* to join in when all the world was lying! [25] And too many other features have a familiar ring—three paragraphs of Platonic similes and *adynata* to illustrate the contest between *ingenium* and *ars* (34-36); [26] more anecdotes about court flattery, reminiscent of *Calumnia* (38-40); a *bon mot* from Alexander the Great about yet another return from Hades (40); [27] and the Sicilian disaster recast in the same mould as Lucian's comic battles (38).[28] It is scarcely

---

[19] *Charon* 12, cf. *Anach.* 31 f., 36.
[20] Croiset 94-96.
[21] Croiset 47; G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*, Meisenheim am Glan 1956, 177 f.
[22] Lukian, *Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, Munich 1965, 60 ff.
[23] Bompaire 343 n. 3.
[24] *Supra* 59 ff., 77 ff.
[25] *Hist.* 4/*VH* I.4.
[26] See also Homeyer *ad loc.*
[27] *Supra* 47 f.
[28] *Supra* 36 ff.

surprising when the ideal historian comes very close to a self-portrait of Lucian; or that he describes the historian's style in much the same terms as he describes Satiric Dialogue.[29]

Lucian has only to deduce most of the technical precepts from his own criticisms of individual 'historians' in 14-33 [30]—not without some contradictions in his theorising; [31] and only a few items of advice have still to be accounted for.[32] He scarcely needs any parallel for the notion—apparently unique—that the historian must have πολιτικὴ σύνεσις (34).[33] Since Lucian considers this to be an instinctive quality, he may be offering it as practical common sense on his own account. He tells us in 37 that the well-equipped writer must have γνώμην στρατιωτικὴν ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ ἐμπειρίαν στρατηγικήν.[34] He could easily have 'invented' the advice as part of his comprehensive list, and then decided to give it special prominence. The historian is also to curtail his prologue (53). This is not unprecedented as historical advice,[35] but Lucian makes fun of pretentious introductions in any context: Timon, the Areopagus, or the unnamed friend in *Nigrinus* object to them just as readily.[36]

Lucian's material, then, follows easily from its context or from his own *idées fixes*. Nor should we be misled by his apparent interest in Thucydides.[37] He cannot set up Herodotus as his ideal, though he knows him much more thoroughly; [38] he has said too

---

[29] *Hist.* 41, 61/*Pisc.* 19; *Hist.* 45/*Bis Acc.* 33.

[30] Cf. Homeyer 23.

[31] Avenarius 64-70.

[32] Συνθήκη ὀνομάτων (46) follows naturally on a discussion of λέξις; the banal advice on sequence of topics (56) springs directly from a discussion of prefaces. The historian is to write preliminary ὑπομνήματα (48): this is almost too banal to call for any 'source' — it may have been suggested by the example of 'Kallimorphos' (16), who left his history at this stage; or it may be Lucian's contribution to τάξις πραγμάτων, to balance συνθήκη ὀνομάτων without taking him into his detailed discussion of τάξις itself (51 ff.).

[33] The phrase itself occurs (Arist. *Pol.* 1291a), as Baldwin points out (*Studies o.c.* 89). But this is irrelevant, since the context is not concerned with historiography.

[34] Homeyer *ad loc.*

[35] Avenarius *o.c.* 116.

[36] *Timon* 37; *Anach.* 19; *Nigr.* 10.

[37] Homeyer *o.c.* 60 is tempted to date her 'model' in the first century B.C., because Lucian admires Thucydides for his brief digressions, and such topics were still a live issue at that time. But in the context of the Atticist revival any banal reference to Thucydides is always relevant.

[38] Householder 15, cf. 38 f.: references to Thucydides are few outside *Historia*.

much against tall story-tellers in the first half of the treatise. This leaves him with Thucydides as the senior 'classical' historian: every art must have its Homer or its Phidias. And Lucian is able to set Thucydides' classic pronouncements in I. 22 side by side with his own ideal of παρρησία.[39] He needs only a handful of celebrated incidents to complete his 'command' of history: the Funeral Speech, the Plague, the Sicilian Expedition, and little else,[40] so that his lip service to Thucydides is as perfunctory as his praise of Plato in *Pisc.* 22. And when he shows so little interest in the master, he is much less likely to have had any interest in Hellenistic historians who would not have been part of his school diet.[41] Nor does he attempt to go beyond Thucydides in the search for historical truth: his historian will still have a licence to practice rhetoric in the inserted speeches (58), or even to 'touch up' battle-scenes and sea-fights (45)—even after what Lucian has said about them in the first half of the treatise.

His approach to art is not much different from his approach to history, and here he will fall back on his repertoire in the same way. French scholars in particular have spared no enthusiasm on his descriptions,[42] but time and time again he betrays that artistic appreciation is merely an excuse rather than an end in itself. In *de Domo* 7 ff. he is quick to pass from describing the ceiling of the auditorium to a series of prefabricated similes: the contrast between the modest woman and the courtesan is similar to his treatment of Panthea;[43] and he is content merely to list the subjects of the paintings which the audience can see (22 ff.), while he concentrates his powers of description on the simile of the peacock.[44] When he does pause to describe the content of a painting, what he selects will coincide with his interests elsewhere. In Aetion's Marriage of Alexander and Roxana (Herod. 5) he concentrates on three details: the embarrassed bride is being stripped by the Cupids—a motif with several echoes in the miniature

---

[39] I.22 cf. *Pisc.* 19 f.

[40] *Hist.* 26; 15; 38, 57.

[41] Cf. Householder 65.

[42] E.g. Croiset 256-284; H. Piot, *Les Procédés littéraires de la seconde sophistique chez Lucien: l'ecphrasis*, Thèse Rennes 1914 *passim*; A. le Morvan, *La description artistique chez Lucien*, *REG* 45 (1932), 380-90.

[43] *Imagines* 11.

[44] 11 f. See Bompaire 718.

dialogues;[45] one of them drags Alexander towards Roxana by the cloak, the kind of situation which underlies several of Lucian's rhetorical allegories;[46] and meanwhile others play in Alexander's armour—just as Hermes plays with the other gods' weapons while still an infant:[47] Lucian never misses an opportunity for describing a pretentious disguise.

When he does commit himself to critical comment in *Zeuxis*, it is as a self-confessed amateur; and the few details he selects are obviously contrived so that he can transfer them to his own work: Zeuxis manages the incongruous joins in a centaur and combines paradoxical qualities into a grotesque hybrid—just as Lucian does in Satiric Dialogue. Naturally his repertoire is that of the journalist who knows the correct names to drop: he includes a list of 'Old Masters' at *Philops.* 18, but only as a joke to expose their boorish owner Eucrates, who prefers a drole caricature with miraculous powers to the real masterpieces of sculpture! Lucian's *magnum opus* in the artistic field, the *Imagines*, relies on a similar catalogue. Even Bompaire, fully aware of his rhetorical expedients, is in rapture over Panthea:[48] 'les œuvres d'art tirent bénéfice de cette co-opération (avec la littérature): ainsi appliquées à un être vivant, elles descendent de leur piédestal . . .': his Lucian has found the ideal synthesis between literature and art. But Lycinus offers no critical reason for taking the nose from one statue or the hair from another to make up the portrait of Panthea. Either the details were almost proverbial, on the same level as the Mona Lisa smile, or he might equally well have combined these *disiecta membra* in any other way. What originality he achieves is not due to any qualities as an art critic, but to his unusual presentation; and this is a variation on a hackneyed *eidolopoiia*. In *Charon* 4 Hermes wishes to show Charon a marvellous sight: he hits on the plan of calling in Homer to perform a miracle and put mountains together to make the spectacle possible. Lucian simply applies the same formula here, in less fantastic circumstances: Lycinus wishes to show Polystratus a wonderful vision (1 ff.), and hits on the plan of calling in ancient artists (3) and the Argument

---

[45] Undressing, *Dear. Iud.* 9 f.; for the bride's embarrassment, *D. Mar.* 15.3, (cf. also *D. Deor.* 17.2).
[46] Cf. *Calumnia* 5; *Rh. Pr.* 9; *Merc. Cond.* 42; *Her.* 3.
[47] *D. Deor.* 7.
[48] 730 (but cf. 346 f.).

itself (5) to perform a similar feat and put statues together. The scale of Panthea's portrait is wrong, and it will need to be blown up. Even this curious detail has its counterpart elsewhere: Hermes needs to blow up Charon's view of the earth till he can see the details!

Lucian's spiritual 'progress' has been treated far more exhaustively than it deserves;[49] here it is only necessary to show that he exploits philosophy in the same way as any other branch of culture. Of course he is only interested in the literary *topoi* of the philosophic schools,[50] but even within this range he selects motifs which converge with the rest of his repertoire. There is no need to look for a 'source' for the miniature doxography in *Icar.* 6-9,[51] when so much of it coincides with his favourite jokes. The sun lets down a bucket to feed the stars from the sea (7): Lucian has simply expanded Aristophanes' parody of Heraclitus, in which the sun draws up the rain;[52] he provides it with a well-rope, an easy variation on his jokes about the golden chain;[53] and it feeds the stars by passing round the moisture—a reminder of Lucian's joke about gods clamouring for rations![54] He also mentions the Socratic oath (9), but this is only one of his collection of extravagant formulae.[55] And he repeats the Epicurean joke on gods who retire from public duty (9),[56] a parallel to his elaborate attacks on Cronos or Chiron in *D. Mort.*[57] And the gods are assigned to three ranks (9). This could be a reference to three grades of actors, which would be no surprise in Lucian;[58] but again the theme combines easily: they are arranged according to Solon's classification in *J. Trag.* 8-12; there are even three ranks of letters in the alphabet (*Iud. Voc.* 5); and Lucian would also know Plato's division of gods at *Ep.* II. 312E.[59]

---

[49] For a convenient summary of the theories of Lucian's 'evolution' through the schools, see Caster, *Pensée* 375-80.

[50] Bompaire 350 ff.; 497 and n. 2.

[51] Cf. Helm *LM* 83 ff. Caster *Pensée* 146 n. 62.

[52] Ar *Nub.* 1280: see Pease on Cic. *DND* II.xv.40.

[53] *J. Conf.* 4, *D. Deor.* 21.1. In *J. Conf.* 8 Zeus himself lets down a well-rope instead of the chain.

[54] *J. Trag.* 13 (cf. *Sacr.* 9).

[55] *Vit Auct.* 4; *Tox.* 37, 38, 48.

[56] Cic. *DND* I.xx.53.

[57] *Sat.* 7, *D. Mort.* 26.

[58] *Metapher und Gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians*, Diss. Zurich, Winterthur 1897, 62; cf. M. Kokolakis, *The Dramatic Simile of Life*, Athens 1960, 55.

[59] He cites *Ep.* III.315B at *pro Lapsu* 4.

When he sets out to exhibit all his 'philosophic' material in one dialogue (*Hermotimus*), his sceptic tropes are no more than a pretext for the illustrations. He includes an ideal city of noble savages, like the Utopias in *VH*.[60] Hermotimus himself is compared to a man who puts towns in the wrong place and thinks he is in Corinth when he is really in Babylon. This development has its parallel in *Historia* and *Navigium*: the historian in Corinth pretends to be in Syria, or the day-dreamer in Athens thinks he is in Babylon.[61] In a similar vein an Ethiopian thinks all men are black without ever leaving Ethiopia—just as the philosophers in *Icaromenippus* talk about men on the moon without ever leaving the earth.[62] There is an elaborate ecphrasis of the perfect woman, who is only an illusion: Lucian has merely to reverse the material about Panthea, the ideal woman he has actually seen.[63] There are other favourites as well: more philosophers up from Hades,[64] another comic battle,[65] an absurd voyage,[66] novel monsters,[67] a fisherman's surprise catch,[68] and yet another version of the water-vessel simile.[69] In *Philopseudes* Lucian could reduce Platonic dialogue to a mere framework for ghost stories; here he sets out instead to disguise some of his most frivolous material [70] as philosophic exempla.

Many ornaments of style—similes, proverbs, anecdotes or quotations—helped the sophist to produce an erudite texture. Lucian's work is rich in similes, most of them banal and thoroughly overworked. But some of them have still to be accounted for, and both Bompaire and Schmidt drew up lists of comparisons which could be original.[71] But in many cases Lucian's originality could

[60] *Herm.* 22/*VH* II.5 ff.; I.22 ff.
[61] *Herm.* 27/*Hist.* 29 cf. 24; *Navig.* 35.
[62] *Herm.* 31/*Icar.* 6 f.
[63] *Herm.* 73, *Imag. passim.*
[64] *Herm.* 30/*Pisc.* 1 ff.
[65] *Herm.* 33 (shadow-boxing)/*supra* 37.
[66] *Herm.* 71/*Navig.* 42-44.
[67] *Herm.* 74/*VH* I.11 ff. and *passim*; *Prom. es* 7.
[68] *Herm.* 65/*Pisc.* 48 ff.
[69] *Herm.* 59 f./*Anach.* 35; *Timon* 18.
[70] This does not mean that any one of them need be new to a philosophic discussion, e.g. *Herm.* 74/Xen. *Mem.* II.iii.18-19, Plut. *Mor.* 478F; here once more Lucian's tastes, motifs and models converge.
[71] See Bompaire 442 n. 2. He surprisingly seems to overlook the Platonic origin of some of the others: lovers, *Nigr.* 7/*Phaedr.* 255D; the farmer, *Anach.* 20, *Euthyphro* 2D; colouring a painting, *Imag.* 16 cf. *Bis Acc.* 8/*R* IV.429E ff.

only amount to transposing the material from some other quarter of his repertoire. Some of the similes are closely related to details in the anecdotes. The upstart philosopher will soon be like an old shoe discarded under the bed; but in a ghost story in *Philopseudes* Eucrates' wife comes back from the dead to remind him about a sandal thrown aside under a chest![72] Philosophers in a temper swell their veins like flautists exerting themselves on a narrow flute. But this comparison grows naturally out of its context. The speaker is Pan, and he has just compared the philosophers' beards to a goat's.[73] Like all of Lucian's rustics he has to draw his analogies from his own very limited experience—and flute-playing is part of it.[74] Moreover Lucian knew a story about an inexperienced flautist who died from blowing too hard.[75] Nor should similes concerned with courtesans[76] occasion any surprise in an author who has written a whole series of *Courtesans' Dialogues*: the courtesan's adornment is an obvious variation on the actor's costume—another false appearance that hides the grim reality underneath.[77] In a similar vein Lucian compares Lexiphanes to figurines coloured on the outside, but clay under the surface. This in turn is a variant on the statue seen from within and without, with an obvious allusion to Plato's comparison of Socrates and the Sileni.[78] In *pro Imaginibus* Lucian compares himself to a viewer looking at an object from too close at hand, so that he has to go back to the right distance: this is yet another version of 'correcting one's vision'—Charon and Menippus have exactly the same problem![79] In another simile of perception Lucian adapts the motif of 'fishing for a surprise catch'. Objects appear larger till fished out of water, disappointing the fisherman: but elsewhere we find the *captator* disappointed when the fish escapes; or the pike, carp, or catfish turns out to be a Cynic dogfish instead.[80] There are two apparently striking comparisons between fallen men and tombstones:[81] but these merely reflect Lucian's general

[72] *Merc. Cond.* 17/*Philops.* 27.
[73] *Bis Acc.* 11.
[74] *Bis Acc.* 12/*D. Deor.* 22.3.
[75] *Harmonides* 3.
[76] *Dom.* 7; *Bis Acc.* 31; cf. *Pisc.* 12, *Imag.* 11.
[77] Cf. *Dom.* 7; *D. Meretr.* 11.3; *Icar.* 29.
[78] *Lex.* 22/*Gall.* 24 f./Pl. *Symp.* 215B.
[79] *pro Imag.* 12/*Charon* 2, 6 cf. *Icar.* 13 ff.
[80] *Electr.* 6/*Timon* 22; *Pisc.* 48.
[81] *Tim.* 5/*Merc. Cond.* 28.

interest in monuments and inscriptions.[82] And the comparison of gods to flies swarming over a sacrifice is only another version of the swarm simile: [83] any writer who can produce *Muscae Encomium* can introduce the fly in this way.

The same applies to proverbs. Once again Lucian offers us a number of expressions which do not occur elsewhere. Did he make them up himself, bring new ones into literature,[84] or simply draw on handbooks of proverbs? [85] He could not of course 'manufacture' a proverb as a sophist might set out to produce his own 'folktale': an audience can only be bewildered if the speaker appeals to the traditional authority of expressions he has never heard of. Bompaire argues from a list of five proverbs in a row at *Merc. Cond.* 13 that such lists were simply prefabricated under a subject-heading in a handbook; but three of them coincide with favourite themes and would therefore be directly to hand: Lucian laughs at the vanity of athletes, at Cyrus' conquests, or at the fools who imitate Alexander and dream of taking Babylon: [86] such proverbs as ἔστεψαι τὰ Ὀλύμπια, τὴν Σάρδεων ἀκρόπολιν καθήρηκας or Βαβυλῶνα εἴληφας gave him readymade variations on this material. Yet another is similar to a *bon mot* which Lucian took from Demonax (ἀμέλξεις ὀρνίθων γάλα/τράγον ἀμέλγειν).[87] Nor must we assume that other lists are 'expressions plus ou moins proverbiales' [88] just because they are lists. Lucian tells us that a fool buys books for profit no more than a bald man buys a comb, a blind man a mirror, a deaf-mute a fluteplayer, a eunuch a concubine, a land-dweller an oar, or a helmsman a plough.[89] For this sort of tirade he only needs four standard rhetorical types—sailor, pilot, flautist, and blind man—and something incongruous to each of them; while the bald man's comb and the eunuch's concubine have obvious links with the anecdotes about Stratonice's baldness or Bagoas' mistress.[90] Nor can Lucian resist conflating

[82] *Supra* 33 ff.
[83] *Sacr.* 9/*Bis Acc.* 13; *Pisc.* 42; *Charon* 15; *Icar.* 19.
[84] This view of Rein's (*Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten bei Lukian*, Diss. Tübingen 1894) is always possible; but in view of Lucian's extreme conservatism with other stylistic devices it seems highly improbable.
[85] Bompaire 419 f.
[86] *Charon* 8, 13; *Navig.* 34.
[87] *Dem.* 28.
[88] Cf. Bompaire 420.
[89] *Adv. Ind.* 19.
[90] *pro Imag.* 5, *Eun.* 10.

two of the expressions even within the same dialogue: at one moment the blind man has a mirror, at another a favourite[91]—and elsewhere Lucian works this latter detail into an anecdote. The list at *Apol.* 11 is still more banal, and Lucian's taste for incongruity in any form will account for all of it: his two modes of life are as like as lead and silver, bronze and gold, anemones and roses, or monkeys and men. Such accumulations need not be proverbs at all, far less borrowed from lists. Any rhetorician could assemble antitheses or *adynata* from his stock and extend the analogies indefinitely; and Lucian could assemble them at random in the same way as lists of any other kind.[92]

Lucian, then, was able to disguise any kind of diversion in a more or less didactic form. His most sustained tour-de-force in this field is his 'documentation' of the oracles of Alexander of Abonoteichos. Because of the many authentic touches in Lucian's pamphlet, scholars have been cautious in assessing his own contribution to these oracles. The inscription he attributes to Sacerdos is highly impiobable;[93] we should also suspect much of the material which surrounds it. Lucian could have drawn on collections of oracles,[94] and Oenomaus of Gadara's γοήτων φωρά shows that there was some Cynic literature against them in the second century.[95] But there was also ample precedent in Herodotus: apart from his repeated allusions to the story of Croesus,[96] Lucian would also be aware of Battus' oracle, as well as the oraclemonger Onomacritus, or the interpreter Mys who could deal with an oracle delivered in Carian.[97] We should also look at his own repertoire: at *J. Trag.* 31 he demonstrates his ability to improvise an oracle. Throughout the dialogue he has given the gods appropriate pastiche in a variety of idioms:[98] here Apollo is made to fumble

---

[91] *Adv. Ind.* 19, *ibid.* 2.

[92] For the metals, cf. *Hist.* 34 (with the characteristic reshuffle gold and lead, silver and tin instead of silver and lead, gold and bronze). For similar lists, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 471D; Philostr. *VS* 515; on Aristides, Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide*, Paris 1923, 444 and n. 1.

[93] *Alex.* 43. So Caster, *Études sur Alexandre* 66, who also suspects 11, 48 and 59 as 'paraphrasés et commentés'. Bompaire (480) is also suspicious of *Alex.* 25/27, 48, and 50 f. (460 n. 4).

[94] Bompaire 460.

[95] See I. Bruns, *RhM N.F.* 44 (1889), 374-96; also Bompaire 482 n. 3.

[96] *Bis Acc.* 1; *J. Trag.* 43; *Charon* 11.

[97] IV.155 ff.; VII.6; VIII.133 ff.

[98] 1 f., 6; 15; 33.

as best he can without his tripod! Both oracles in *Peregrinus* are just as obviously Lucian's own invention: we are being asked to believe that he heard an 'anonymous' critic who claims to quote from memory Theagenes' report of a Sibylline oracle—exactly quoted at fourth hand! [99] It would be natural for Lucian to extend such invention into a series, similar to the parodies of decrees and laws.[100] Occasionally he has slipped up and failed to cover his tracks: we hear of an oracle Alexander 'pretended' to give in response to no question (52): Lucian could have known this for certain only if he had written the bogus reply himself. He also asked if Alexander was bald: did he really suspect this before it emerged from medical evidence on Alexander's deathbed? [101]

There is not a great deal of 'Lucianic' material in the first three oracles (11, 18, 24), which are only concerned with establishing Alexander's cult. After this however Lucian's interests are clear. There is a good deal of conventional satire on oracle-mongery, including a direct imitation of Croesus' infamous Delphic oracle,[102] and a pair of contradictory pronouncements like the two in *Peregrinus*.[103] We are told that Alexander refers his customers to fellow-impostors—in the same way as Trophonius refers an enquiry to Amphilochus, or Hesiod refers a critic to his fellow-charlatan Homer.[104] Alexander refuses to disclose the truth about Didyma, Clarus and Delphi: again one notes that Trophonius is evasive when Menippus starts asking awkward questions.[105]

To supply some of the oracles Lucian only needs to use a few of his well-worn clichés about Hades. Not only is death inevitable,[106] but a dead child is to have lessons with Homer and Pythagoras in the underworld—just as Menippus picked up versification direct from Homer on his visit below; and after all Lucian's kings and satraps hold regular classes there! [107] Alexander's enemy Epicurus also turns up in Hades, lying in filth in leaden fetters. This is

---

[99] *Peregr.* 29 f.; cf. Helm *LM* 137 n. 3.

[100] For the decrees, see Householder, *TAPhA* 71 (1940), 199-216; Bompaire 637 ff.

[101] *Alex.* 53, 59.

[102] *Alex.* 27, cf. *J. Trag.* 31.

[103] *Alex.* 27, *Peregr.* 29 f.

[104] *Alex.* 29; *D. Mort.* 3.1, *Hes.* 5.

[105] *Alex.* 43, *D. Mort.* 3.

[106] *Alex.* 28, cf. *D. Mort. passim.*

[107] *Alex.* 33, *Neky.* 1; *Neky.* 17.

as typical a fabrication as Eucrates' vision in *Philopseudes*, where Socrates is lying in asphodel.[108] In other oracles Lucian can indulge his interest in fantastic transmigrations: Rutilianus has been Achilles and Menander, and will one day be a sunbeam; in *Gall.* Pythagoras was Euphorbus, Aspasia and Crates in succession. Sacerdos' incarnations are camel, horse, and prophet; in the same passage of *Gall.* Homer was a camel, while the cock was Pythagoras, Crates and a horse in turn.[109] Alexander's Glycon will move on to Bactria—of course the place where Homer spent his time as a camel! And there is plenty of fun too with the usual objects of Lucian's religious satire. Sacerdos is not to learn whether Glycon is the same as the former Asclepius, or whether there are two of them: Diogenes receives evasive replies when he asks how many Heracleses there were.[110] Alexander himself is to ascend to Zeus, smitten by a thunderbolt (40), just as Peregrinus goes out in his blaze of glory: once more Lucian is interested in burnt demigods.[111] The consular Rutilianus is told to marry Alexander's daughter by Selene, just as Lucian is offered Endymion's moonchild. Glycon will live a thousand and three years in Paphlagonia: the figure recurs again at *Katapl.* 4—as a day's tally of corpses![112] And Sacerdos is warned to avoid the Epicurean Lepidus—no surprise in an author so fond of enigmatic taboos.[113]

There is room too for shady intrigues.[114] The oracle at c. 50 is vague and complicated, but each of the details has its echo elsewhere in the *Corpus*. A slave debauches his master's wife after the master corrupts him: but the servant Megapenthes used to beat also debauches his master's concubine; the ex-slave Cantharus abducts someone else's wife; and Eucrates' wife amuses the cook.[115] Alexander's oracle has a plan to poison the master, as in *Katapl.* 11; and it reveals that the poison is hidden under the bed in the corner, just as in *Philops.* 27 a 'medium' reveals to Eucrates that he will find a sandal under the chest;[116] and Lucian also supplies a lover's

---

[108] *Alex.* 25 cf. *Philops.* 24.
[109] *Alex.* 34, *Gall.* 16-20; 43, *Gall. ibid.*
[110] *Alex.* 43, *D. Mort.* 16.
[111] *Alex.* 40, *Icar.* 13, *D. Mar.* 11, *D. Deor.* 13.
[112] *Alex.* 43, *Katapl.* 4.
[113] *Alex.* 43, *VH* II.28, *Gall.* 18.
[114] Cf. however the fantastic intrigues around Scopelian, Philostr. *VS* 517.
[115] *Katapl.* 12, *Fugit.* 27 ff., *Gall.* 32.
[116] *Philops.* 27.

accomplice, a natural ingredient for a writer of *Courtesans' Dialogues*. In *Alex.* 52 there is a more enigmatic situation. The oracle reveals that the enquirer is to return home: his master has been murdered by a neighbour in league with bandits who have now been caught. This reads like a conflation of two hints in *Toxaris*: Demetrius returns to find that his friend has been imprisoned because of a servant in league with bandits, who again have been caught; and Adyrmachus receives a message and changes his route, since his father-in-law has been murdered by a stranger in league with the enemy.[117]

There is also room for a good deal of pure nonsense among the *pseudos*: Alexander supplies two quack cures as absurd as those of *Philops.*; [118] and two nonsense oracles in pseudo-Scythian. Lucian is always interested in pretentious jargon; and one of them seems to describe an ascent to heaven like that of Peregrinus.[119] Lucian himself asks the oracle an irrelevant question on Homer's birthplace—the question he puts to Homer himself in *VH* II. 20—and receives the wrong answer. He makes fun of this kind of *non sequitur* at *Merc. Cond.* 11, where a young philosopher answers the wrong Homeric question!

It should be clear enough from this list how easily Lucian could turn an attack on a private enemy into a literary game pursued for its own sake. And Alexander was not alive to question the attribution of any oracle.

We can explain Lucian's contribution to folk-medicine along similar lines.[120] At *Philops.* 7 f. the philosophers are locked in disagreement: is a lion's pelt a cure for gout? One of them quotes a Libyan 'authority' to prove that the lion's skin is more efficacious than the hind's—since lions catch hinds! Is this remedy authentic? [121] It does not appear in the enormous dossier of cures for gout compiled by the author of *Podagra*; [122] and the Elder Pliny cites only the lion's gall as a cure for bad eyesight.[123] Quack medicine is an obvious target for burlesque, and Lucian had the

---

[117] *Tox.* 30, 51.
[118] 25, 53; *Philops.* 7.
[119] *Supra* 52 ff.
[120] For Lucian's entirely rhetorical 'command' of medicine, see Bompaire 433 ff.
[121] As Müller believed (Commentary, *Eos Suppl.* 13, 1932, *ad loc.*)
[122] *Podagra* 140-174.
[123] *NH* XXVIII.xxv.90.

means to do it. The context of his discussion here is important. The scene is modelled on two 'Socratic' episodes: Pl. *Charmides* 155B, where the dialogue opens with a discussion on cures for headache, and *Phaedo* 60B, where Socrates discusses the pain in his leg. Socrates' discussion of scientific trivia at Ar. *Nub.* 143 ff.[124] is also an invitation to burlesque. Lucian has a taste for scenes where fools make 'erudite' enquiries about ludicrous details (did the vulture-soul of Peregrinus fly East or West? Does Alexander have the same soul as Pythagoras, or just one like it?[125]). Against this background we can scarcely take the present point on trust, more especially when the philosophers go on to discuss the potency of the lion's whiskers and right forepaw! Lucian uses the lion's skin as a comic motif in other contexts,[126] and he needs it here to prepare the way for his joke about the limping lion (8). He also parodies sympathetic magic at *Icar.* 14, where the sharp-eyed eagle's wing effects a cure for the eyes. And it is no effort to produce an exotic 'authority' for all this: false eyewitnesses are one of his most characteristic sources of fun.[127]

The same applies to Lucian's remedy for snake-bite (11). Did he borrow literally, from Nicander or some similar author?[128] He certainly mentions him in a similar context, *Dips.* 9, but this may be mere lip service to the appropriate 'expert'; his own list of snakes at *Dips.* 3 is not very formidable. In *Philopseudes* a fragment from a girl's tombstone is bound to a vinedresser's foot. Now Pliny notes that a fragment from the nail or cord of a cross may be bound to the neck of quartan patients;[129] and that the touch from a prematurely dead person of the same sex[130] will cure various afflictions. Lucian's version could conceivably be authentic, but again burlesque is more likely. Not only is the cure attached to the wrong part of a person of the wrong sex: Lucian's picture is obviously meant to be ludicrous—a man carrying his bed with a stone attached to his foot! and he makes uses of this kind of caricature elsewhere: the Greeks make a sally against the enemy—in buskins! Lucian allows himself to be dragged

---

[124] Lucian refers to the passage specifically at *Prom. es* 6.
[125] *Peregr.* 39, *Alex.* 40.
[126] *Fugit.* 33, *Neky.* 8.
[127] *Philops.* 24, *Peregr.* 40, *Hist.* 29, *Icar.* 6, *VH* I.4.
[128] Cf. Bompaire 534 and n. 2.
[129] *NH* XXVIII.xi.46.
[130] *Ibid.* 45.

off, although he has one foot in Charon's boat; and Ploutos is a swift runner, despite his lameness.[131]

Lucian did not escape the interest in Attic usage which is so characteristic of the Second Sophistic; and he could join the quarrels it gave rise to. But he is scarcely ever absorbed in linguistic niceties to the exclusion of literature: his favourite clichés reappear even in the most recondite subject-matter. One scarcely expects any point of contact between the rest of the *Corpus* and the *Iudicium Vocalium*, a courtroom speech written round some forty puns on words which have undergone consonantal change! [132] But Lucian has combined his interests in linguistic niceties with his taste for unusual trials; and Sigma takes his stand against the incursion of a foreign letter, just as Momus spreads panic about the foreign gods in *Deor. Conc.* Several of the more absurd details also have their counterpart elsewhere: Letters have their unlikely boundary-disputes, like the sun and moon in *VH*; they also have their own lawgiver, as the lamps in *VH* have their own court and judge; or three ranks of precedence, like Lucian's gods or heroes.[133] They can even have their own retinue, just like allegorical figures: Lucian's Tau is accompanied by Alpha and Upsilon, as Ploutos is followed by Interest and Accounting! [134] Sigma and Rho discover a scandal, like Hermes and Heracles in *Fugitivi*; [135] Thucydides helps Xi to win territory from Sigma as easily as Odysseus takes sides with Homer against Thersites; [136] and Tau commits outrages against the tongue, like Lucian's enemy 'Atimarchus'.[137]

Lexiphanes' monologue (*Lex.* 2-15) is a bizarre 'counter-banquet' to Plato's *Symposium*, told in Hyperattic jargon. Lucian takes the opportunity to vary a number of favourite motifs by means of this execrable diction.

Many are Platonic in origin; but they are variations to be seen alongside Lucian's other efforts on the same themes: a visit to the oculist, the uninvited guest, the nautical simile, or the activities at the gymnasium.[138] Deinias exposes initiates in the Mysteries,

[131] *Anach.* 32, *Apol.* 1, *Timon* 25, cf. 20.

[132] Helm (*PW* 1746) relates it only to other parodies of official language.

[133] *Iud. Voc.* 4/*VH* I.12; 5/*VH* I.29; 5/*Icar.* 9, *VH* II.9.

[134] 6/*Tim.* 13, cf. *Dear. Iud.* 16 (Aphrodite's retinue).

[135] 7/*Fugit.* 27 ff.

[136] 9/*VH* II.20.

[137] 11/*Pseudolog.* 25.

[138] *Lex.* 4/*Nigr.* 2; 9/*Conv.* 12; 15/*J. Trag.* 46 ff., *Merc. Cond.* 1-2; 5/*Anach.* 1 ff.

and they take revenge, as the Galloi revenge themselves on Lucius in the *Onos*.[139] The healing statue of Artemis invites comparison with Pellichus' statue in *Philopseudes*.[140] There is even a parasite-fish, like the philosopher-fish in *Piscator*.[141] And Lexiphanes is horrified to meet his opponent Lycinus, just as Lucian in turn is horrified to meet his own critic Atimarchus in *Pseudologistes*.[142]

When Lucian has made a mistake he gives less space to literary ornament and more to sheer erudition. In *pro Lapsu inter salutandum* he presents his patron with a score of examples by way of an apology for just one *faux pas*—and he flippantly adds that he might just have made his mistake as an excuse for his essay (19). Did Lucian really need a handbook for this kind of information? [143] At least one was in existence, but this does not mean that he had to consult it.[144] He finds himself called upon on one occasion to supply a catalogue of engineers, (*Hippias* 2), but he would scarcely need a directory of ancient mechanics to furnish him with Archimedes, Thales, Epeius and Sostratus! Even if he had actually collected all his examples *before* he made his 'blunder', it does not follow that he had unearthed a recondite source which he wished to pass off as his own research. In *pro Lapsu* he has the opportunity to develop two motifs from elsewhere: in *Merc. Cond.* the resident philosopher's first worry is how to avoid making nervous slips in front of his patron; and in *Rh. Pr.* Lucian advises the would-be rhetor to defend any slips by making up fictitious 'authorities' for them.[145] He may even have taken his own advice in *pro Lapsu* 10, where the only literary parallel to his own error is ascribed to an unknown Dionysodorus, reporting on Ptolemy Lagus' correspondence with Seleucus! Given Lucian's interest in bogus historio-

---

[139] 10/*Onos* 38.

[140] 12/*Philops.* 18 (Bompaire 624).

[141] 6/*Pisc.* 47 ff.

[142] 19/*Pseudolog.* 8.

[143] Bompaire (394 and n. 1, cf. 343 n. 2) assumes that he did, and Gerhard (*Ph* 64, 1905, 48 f. and n. 67) suggested Dionysius of Alexandria's περὶ τοῦ ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ χαίρειν τοῦ τε ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (1st c.B.C.).

[144] S. Walz (*Geschichtlichen Kenntnisse* 58 f.) noticed the rather obvious nature of some of Lucian's material, and concluded that he used his supposed handbook sparingly. Moreover not every catalogue a sophist cites has to come direct from a handbook: Philostratus (*VA* VII.2) lists no fewer than nine examples of philosophers who dealt with tyrants, but admits that his instances are ἐν λόγῳ πᾶσιν.

[145] *Merc. Cond.* 11, *Rh. Pr.* 17.

graphy,[146] and his facility with proper names, this author deserves to remain under suspicion.[147]

It is worth noticing that by no means all Lucian's information would automatically appear in a treatise on greetings: notably the fact that Nikias dispensed with the formulae,[148] which he could easily have deduced from his own recollections of Thucydides.[149] And tags or stories about health have nothing at all to do with the use of ὑγιαίνειν as a greeting.[150] When Lucian tells us that Pyrrhus prays for health instead of victory, wealth, or glory, he may be drawing on a handbook of moral exempla;[151] he is not drawing on a list of greetings as such.

Moreover a number of the quotations which Lucian uses were easily accessible in their own right. He admits that his tag from Ariphron of Sicyon is the most hackneyed of expressions: the same is true of the quotations from *Iliad* IX and Euripides' *Phoenissae*,[152] two of the best-known school classics; and he has also drawn from the openings of two celebrated works of Plato;[153] and from the routine tags ascribed to standard philosophers. Another two quotations come from celebrated highlights of school history. Lucian misquotes Herodotus' story of Philippides, but this is probably due to careless recollection.[154] He also cites Cleon's greeting from Sphacteria, which is not in Thucydides; but he had to know it to understand a passage of Aristophanes which he imitates elsewhere. And the words πρῶτα μὲν χαίρειν Ἀθηναίοισι καὶ τοῖς ξυμμάχοις are merely a Greek version of 'England expects . . .'[155]

It is clear that much of the material was within Lucian's basic repertoire, and most of the rest well within his sphere of interest; I find it improbable that he took the trouble to consult a treatise even if he knew of one. It is easier to take his own reaction at its

---

146 *Supra* 116 ff.

147 Bompaire 699 ff.

148. Walz, *o.c.* 45.

149 3/VII.10. He remembers book VII in some detail, *Hist.* 38.

150 This accounts for the tags from Philemon, Plato and Ariphron (6).

151 *Pro Lapsu* 11; Lucian constantly uses the motif of prayer for the wrong things (*J. Conf.* 1; *Sat.* 1; *Icar.* 25).

152 *Laps.* 2/IX.225; *ibid.*/Eur. *Phoen.* 1453 (see Householder 57, 59).

153 *Laps.* 6/*Gorgias* 451E; 4/*Ep.* III.315BC.

154 Walz, *o.c.* 20.

155 It is quoted by scholia on Ar. *Nub.* 608, *Plut.* 422. Lucian imitates *Nub.* 607 at *Icar.* 20.

face value. At the outset he expected to be at a loss for something to say, but as he went on the material simply presented itself (2). He was proud to proclaim how far he was able to go with so little effort.

His other *faux pas* is not so easy to explain. The *Pseudologista* is a virulent attack on a sophist who has scoffed at Lucian's own use of the word ἀποφράς,[156] and he goes to great lengths to show that his rival is immoral as well as illiterate. The second-century sophists were extremely sensitive about solecisms, but what was the charge against Lucian, and why does he reply at such inordinate length? From his own account it is not entirely clear whether he applied the forbidden word to his victim as a simile or as (too bold?) a metaphor; [157] hence the suspicion that he perpetrated a questionable gender (ἀποφράς being normally used in association with ἡμέρα), by applying it directly to a *masculine* subject; he would then write an elaborate diversion to conceal his 'error'.[158] But Lucian could have excused himself all too easily: he had only to say in so many words that a notorious effeminate deserves the feminine gender! [159]

On the other hand, there is good reason to take him at his word, that only the meaning of ἀποφράς is really at stake.[160] The decisive evidence is this: he does finally apply the term to a masculine noun (ἤ σοι ἀποφράδα τὸν βίον ὅλον ἐργάσεται 32): he could scarcely repeat the 'error'—even as a gesture of defiance—if he were really so anxious to conceal it.

If he was not worrying about the gender, we are left with two possibilities. He may be writing his superfluous display largely for its own sake, and this would be consistent with what he does elsewhere. In *pro Lapsu* 19 he had suggested that he committed

---

[156] Cf. Philostratus *VS* 578-9; *VA* IV.5; Lucian *Rh. Pr.* 17.

[157] The sophist is ἀποφράδι ὅμοιος (1); in what purport to be Lucian's own words, as reported by Menander's prologue Ἔλεγχος, the sophist's appearance was likely τὴν ἡδίστην ἡμέραν ἀποφράδα ἡμῖν ποιήσειν (8); Lucian claims the right εἰκάσαι παμπόνηρον ἄνθρωπον . . . ἡμέρᾳ δυσφήμῳ on the analogy of the nickname ἑβδόμας (16); but asks why he should not (τῷ τοιούτῳ) ἀποφράδα ὀνομάζεσθαι (23).

[158] A. M. Harmon, *LCL* V *ad* 1, 8, 16; Bompaire 472 n. 5.

[159] As Bompaire realised, *ibid.*—if Lucian did not know the instance in Eupolis (fgt. 308K) where ἀποφράς is clearly masculine.

[160] B. Baldwin, *CR N.S.* 12 (1962), 2-5: Baldwin however stresses the integrity of Lucian's statements. But it would certainly not be out of character for Lucian to suppress the real reason for his defence.

his 'fault' only in order to write his *apologia*, while in the *Apologia pro Merc. Cond.* he defends himself ostentatiously for taking up a post which was quite obviously not comparable to the one he had earlier condemned in *Merc. Cond.* Here too the attack need not be Lucian's excuse for using the word; ἀποφράς may be the excuse for his attack.

On the other hand, if Lucian's mouthpiece is not reporting the incident accurately (8), it is quite possible that Lucian *himself* was as much in the dark about the sophist's objections as we are. If he only laughed at the word in Lucian's presence, instead of lampooning its meaning, then his attacker would have no means of knowing whether its gender, meaning or usage was under fire; Lucian may have decided to cover himself against all three.[161]

These examples, then, cover a large cross-section of Lucian's activity; and they confirm that he exploits a basic repertoire of motifs more intensively than most scholars have acknowledged. He contaminates them with the same facility whether he is describing a fantastic picture in Gaul or a contemporary charlatan in Athens; and the same theme is liable to form the nucleus of a trivial story or the trappings of a 'learned' treatise. We cannot expect to determine exactly where Lucian's sources end and his reworking begins—or where fact runs out and fiction takes over; but we can always tell where they overlap; and it is here that converging cross-references can never be left out of account. These examples of self-imitation point in one direction: to a tall-story teller and opportunist ranging over a number of topics, and not likely to confine his fictions to the two or three places where he boasts about his lies. Nor is he likely to rely in more than the most perfunctory way on rhetoricians' manuals—his equipment in this field is perhaps even more elementary than even Bompaire would have us believe; and on present evidence we should credit Lucian with all the more resourcefulness—within the narrow areas where his sources converge and overlap.

One question has always to be asked: how far does he develop any material for its own sake, or include it in a work simply for

[161] It has now been pointed out (by J. Mikalson, *AJPh* 96, 1975, 19-27) that Lucian's description of an ἀποφρὰς ἡμέρα in c. 12 f. is in fact that of a Roman *dies ater*, which was by no means identical. This is fully consistent with Lucian's superficial interest in antiquities—and with his habit of assimilating Attic and Imperial institutions (for similar anachronisms and inaccuracies, see Bompaire 521).

the sake of including it? At what point does variation become an end in itself, regardless of what the author has set out to do? This affects every work from *Hermotimus* to the *Apologia pro Mercede Conductis*. We should not read Lucian or extract information from him without being aware that he is trying to assimilate every subject to every other.

CHAPTER NINE

ARRANGEMENT OF THEMES I: SOME RECURRENT PATTERNS

We can expect to find the same techniques at work on a larger scale when Lucian welds his themes into whole works. The handbooks give no recipes for Satiric Dialogue; and Lucian could be expected to find his own formulae—with as little effort as possible. He can borrow the framework from one of his previous works purely for his own convenience, or because he regards it as a *tour de force* to work over the same basic plan in two different ways. Few scholars have shown any interest in Lucian's methods here; most have assumed that he had none. Müller [1] and Bompaire traced the remnants of formulae from rhetorical textbooks which Lucian employs from time to time: if there is no rhetorician's rule for a particular type of work, then they assume that it can have no structure either. Only O. Schissel von Fleschenberg [2] studied Lucian with the assumption that he could organize material in a deliberate—and arbitrary—manner; but his study was confined to a small number of dialogues, and his conclusions are too erratic to win any converts. The prevailing attitude was dictated by M. Croiset [3] over ninety years ago: Lucian writes straight from his heart or imagination, and any notion of artifice is ruled out. But little now remains of Croiset's concept of *Lucien moralisé*, and a completely new and detailed investigation is long overdue: too many of Croiset's successors have already found that at least one dialogue does not turn out precisely as they had expected. We have yet to see how far Lucian was content to transfer a plan from one work to the next without troubling to adapt it fully to his new subject-matter.

Once again the schools encourage the student to follow a stereotyped sequence of headings: he has only to work two different γνῶμαι with the headings in the same order to produce two parallel

---

[1] *De Luciani dialogorum rhetoricorum compositione*, *Eos* 32 (1930), 559-86.
[2] *Novellenkränze Lukians*, *Rhetorische Forschungen* I, Halle 1912.
[3] *Essai sur la vie et les oeuvres de Lucien*, Paris 1882.

sets of variations;[4] and he would continue this approach right up to the most advanced exercises.[5] In practice not all sophists maintained any interest in composition: Aelius Aristides is as little concerned with it as he is with self-pastiche.[6] Once more it is the novelists who cultivate it on the grand scale and indulge in parallelism at all costs, even in what appears to be the most imaginative of genres: the heroine can be promised away to similar suitors in similar episodes;[7] parallel intrigues are everywhere;[8] lovers awaken to each other in almost identical scenes,[9] and in Longus even digressions can be organised as parallel stories about metamorphosis.[10]

Once again too Lucian could have found abundant examples of parallel groups of incidents in his classical reading. Aristophanes also used parallel composition between episodes;[11] and he tended to fall back on similar situations at corresponding points in several different plays: Euripides and Socrates appear in the course of their curious meditation immediately after the introductory material of *Acharnians* and *Clouds* respectively; Strepsiades witnesses the debate of the *Logoi* after the parabasis, as does Dionysus in the contest of poets;[12] and most plays develop automatically into a loose series of encounters between the hero and the impostors, before the final scenes of revelry.[13] Plato is equally uninhibited about repeating stereotyped elements: opening scenes at the palaestra,[14] arguments arranged in a predictable progression, or

---

[4] Cf. *supra* 3.

[5] Including the standard structure of the judicial speech: see Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer*, Munich 1901 35 ff.

[6] Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide o.c.* 448.

[7] Charicleia is promised in turn to Thyamis (Heliodorus I.22), a rich merchant (V.21), Trachinus (V.28) and Pelorus (V.30).

[8] Heliodorus I.11 f. (Thisbe-Deimainete)/I.15 ff. (Thisbe-Arsinoe); Longus I.15 f., 19 (Dorcon-Chloe)/III.15 ff. (Lycaenion-Daphnis); Xenophon of Ephesus I.16.

[9] Longus I.14/18; Xen. Ephes. I.3 ff.

[10] Longus I.27/II.34/III.23; cf. the tragic tales inserted in Xen. Ephes. III.2, V.1.

[11] K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes Clouds*, Oxford 1968, 209 f. compares the sequence of topics in the debate between the *Logoi* and the tragedians' contest in *Ran.*

[12] *Ach.* 396/*Nub.* 218 ff.; *Nub.* 889 ff./*Ran.* 755 ff.

[13] See the analyses in A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Oxford 1927, 312 ff.

[14] *Supra* 6 f.

concluding myths about the after-life [15] are all a familiar part of his literary technique. We know nothing about how Menippus arranged his material: [16] diatribe clichés scarcely call for deliberate organisation. But Horace at any rate lapses into a plan he has used already, even in his most casual *sermones*: in both *Sat.* I. 6 and II. 3 he glides into his main theme from an introduction only loosely related to it.[17] And like his models Lucian becomes a writer of habit.

When he writes two parallel passages he seldom misses the chance to carry them as far as possible. On two occasions he is writing about a fool who has the chance to attain his ends with a magic device: in *Gallus* Micyllus is to have a magic feather, while in *Navigium* Timolaus is to have the 'ring of Gyges'.[18] Helm and Husson duly note the parallel,[19] but neither has commented on how Lucian extends it. Both characters are so greedy that they want to use far more magic than is really necessary—Micyllus pulls two feathers from the cock's tail instead of one, while Timolaus wants five rings to do the job of one. Other fantastic episodes are developed in the same way. In *Charon* Hermes decides to put Pelion on Ossa, while in *Navigium* Samippus day-dreams that he is about to defeat the Persians.[20] In both passages a cautious friend intervenes and tries to opt out of such a mad scheme before it is too late: Charon feels that the mountains are a rather precarious stage-set; [21] Lycinus feels unsteady on his imaginary horse.

Not every parallel detail fits its context: once Micyllus has his magic feather, his first impulse is to take revenge on his neighbour Simon for the theft of a bowl, which has been mentioned beforehand; [22] but when Samippus has conquered the Persians,[23] he too has still to take revenge on his old neighbour Cydias over

[15] *Phaedo* 107C ff.; *Gorgias* 523A ff.; *R* 613E ff.

[16] Helm implies that the alternation of scenes between heaven and earth is 'Menippean' (*LM passim*). But there is simply no evidence.

[17] N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* 14, 194; further examples in M. J. McGann, *Some structural devices in the Satires and Epistles of Horace*, B. Litt. thesis (unpublished), Oxford 1954; U. Knoche, *Ph* 90 (1935), 372-90; 469-82.

[18] *Gall.* 28/*Navig.* 42.

[19] *LM* 338; Husson *ad loc.*

[20] *Charon* 3 ff./*Navig.* 28 ff.

[21] *Charon* 5, cf. Trygaeus' instructions to the scene-shifters at Ar. *Pax.* 174 ff.; *Navig.* 30.

[22] *Gall.* 28; *ibid.* 14.

[23] *Navig.* 38.

a boundary-dispute. Lucian has merely transferred his 'diatribe' cliché from one context to another, and brought it into line with the impressive scale of Samippus' exploits. But it does not belong to Alexander's career, like the rest of Samippus' dream, nor has Cydias been previously mentioned; Lucian simply feels obliged to continue the parallel for good measure and include all he can.

It is not far from these extended parallels to whole episodes contrived as parallel sequences. Whenever Lucian is writing two works based on similar material, he has only to arrange the various doublets in the same order in both. In *Icaromenippus* and *Charon* his centrepiece is a long interlude where the principal character reviews the state of mankind as seen from above. For each 'block' of material in the one dialogue he has found a substitute to fit the corresponding position in the other: the explorer (Menippus or Charon) sees a series of exempla (from Hellenistic history or Herodotus);[24] he compares the confusion of human life (to a muddled chorus or a tangled web);[25] each man's life comes to an end (at the whim of the choregus, or of fate); power is futile (in the form of territory or kingship);[26] men must be compared to trivial things (ants or bubbles)[27]—with appropriate antique authority (the fable of the Myrmidons or the Homeric leaf-simile).

There are equally obvious doublets in *Somnium* and *Rhetorum Praeceptor*: Lucian is following two similar models, the Allegory of Prodicus and the *Pinax* of Ps.-Cebes, and there is plenty of scope for assimilating the details still further. He describes a dream about two women pleading for himself, or paints a picture of two teachers wooing a pupil.[28] In each case the first speaker is rough and masculine, either slurring her speech or talking nonsense,[29] and recommending that the pupil should imitate an Old Master—Phidias or Demosthenes.[30] The second pleader is good-looking and offers the pupil a ride in a winged car for all the world to see.[31] It is easy enough to make two ecphrases[32] correspond

[24] *Icar.* 15/*Charon* 9-14.
[25] *Icar.* 17/*Charon* 16.
[26] *Icar.* 18/*Charon* 18.
[27] *Icar.* 19/*Charon* 19.
[28] *Somn.* 5 ff./*Rh. Pr.* 6 ff.
[29] *Somn.* 6, 8/*Rh. Pr.* 9.
[30] *Somn.* 8/*Rh. Pr.* 9.
[31] *Somn.* 6, 15/*Rh .Pr.* 11.
[32] Bompaire (255 f.) explains *Rh. Pr.* rather unconvincingly as a δικανικὸς λόγος.

point by point in this way. But in a number of the miniature dialogues even the 'plots' as a whole fall into pairs. He has two conversations in *D. Mar.* where other gods are curious about Zeus' schemes to see that his mistress has a safe confinement; [33] and two miniature dramas in *D. Meretr.* where the girl's companion causes a misunderstanding and brings about a lovers' quarrel.[34] In *D. Mort.* almost half the sketches can be arranged as doublets: both Diogenes and Menippus make fun of charlatans who pretend to have a double elsewhere; and a timely appeal to predestination saves both Sostratus and Protesilaus just in time.[35]

All these examples are merely mass-produced variations which Lucian has worked out on the slightest of patterns. But in two much larger works, *Icaromenippus* and *Nekyomanteia,* his use of parallelism is more sustained: once he has laid down an outline he will exploit the same sequence over again. Of course there is a natural symmetry between journeys to heaven and Hades,[36] but Lucian has carried the correspondence much further: Menippus is to account for his otherworldly behaviour (going over calculations or reciting verses to himself); [37] he has just returned from a trip (to heaven or Hades); he was disillusioned with the philosophers and their disagreements (physical or moral); [38] there is a detailed account of his preparations (practice flights or magic hocus-pocus); [39] he surveys the follies of mankind (from the moon or from Hades); [40] and illustrates with an extended simile (the chorus or the actor).[41] There is then a consultation-scene (with Zeus or

---

[33] *D. Mar.* 7 (Notus-Zephyrus)/10 (Iris-Poseidon).

[34] *D. Meretr.* 2 (Myrtion-Pamphilus-Doris)/12 (Joessa-Lysias-Pythias).

[35] *D. Mort.* 3 (Diogenes-Heracles)/16 (Menippus-Trophonius); 30 (Minos-Sostratus)/19 (Aeacus-Protesilaus). Others are the *syncrisis* between Alexander and a rival (12/14); Pluto discussing two old men who outlive their *captatores* (5/6); the *captator* who meets the fate he deserves (7/8); arguments with Charon over money (4/22); and Homeric heroes who refuse to accept their change of fortune (29/15).

[36] Bruns, *RhM N.F.* 43 (1888), 192 ff.; Hirzel II.317 f.; others have developed the pattern, but only in passing—to establish a chronology (Croiset 61); a 'character' for Menippus (H. Piot, *Un personnage de Lucien: Ménippe,* Rennes 1914, 244); or a common source (O. Hense, *Festschrift f. Th. Gomperz,* 1893, 194 f., cf. Helm *LM* 82 f. with W. Capelle, *BPhW* 24, 1914, 265 f.).

[37] *Icar.* 1-3/*Neky.* 1-2.

[38] *Icar.* 4-9/*Neky.* 3-5.

[39] *Icar.* 10 f./*Neky.* 6-9.

[40] *Icar.* 12, 15 f./*Neky.* 11-15.

[41] *Icar.* 17/*Neky.* 16.

Tiresias),[42] and a council-scene (of gods or corpses),[43] before he returns to earth.[44]

Lucian has kept up the parallel sequence until just before the end. But in *Neky.* the assembly scene (19 f.) comes before Menippus' interview with Tiresias (21); whereas in *Icar.* (29 ff.) it falls *after* his interview with Zeus (23 ff.). Why should Lucian break the pattern? In both cases he has his models to take into account. In Aristophanes' *Frogs* the assembly of the Dead is introduced as a digression, and Dionysus resumes the real purpose of his descent as an afterthought; [45] so here Menippus joins in an assembly which happens to be going on, then remembers his business with Tiresias. On the other hand Trygaeus has a prominent entry into heaven in the *Peace*: [46] Lucian gives Menippus a similar one (*Icar.* 21), and this calls naturally for a confrontation with Zeus straight away. Whichever dialogue Lucian wrote first, he has made use of the same elaborate pattern of incidents over again with only minor adjustments.

The same is true of the structure of *VH* and *Toxaris*, which I have analysed elsewhere. It is clear that Lucian can manipulate parallel narratives of any length. But in the cases we have looked at so far he has only to piece together his schemes from short, self-contained incidents which he could have assembled in any other order; there is no overall plot to manage. But most of Lucian's larger compositions do have a plot—if only a crude framework to which he can attach a varied range of rhetorical clichés. Does he show the same economy here also, and make the same framework do duty again and again, or does he take over arrangements from his models? Croiset vigorously denied that he had any technique of organising the dialogues, and I quote his doctrine at length, if only because of its lasting influence: in his eyes Lucian's composition consists of 'l'enchaînement logique des arguments quand il y en a, ou, à défaut d'arguments, c'est la succession naturelle des scènes . . .' These arise naturally out of each other, so that '. . . de plan détaillé, il n'en a pas; arranger d'avance toutes ses inventions, grandes ou petites, lui serait d'autant plus

[42] *Icar.* 23 ff./*Neky.* 21.
[43] *Icar.* 29-33/*Neky.* 19 f.
[44] *Icar.* 34/*Neky.* 22.
[45] *Ran.* 755 ff., 1414 ff.
[46] *Pax* 179 ff.

impossible qu'il ignore lui-même, en commençant, une bonne partie d'entre elles . . .' (338) '. . . Un tel plan est en quelque sorte spontané; il n'exige pas d'étude attentive du sujet; c'est la forme naturelle que prend celui-ci en se transformant en drame; chacune des parties a sa raison d'être dans les nécessités les plus apparentes de la démonstration à faire, et l'ordre de ces parties est lui-même réglé tout naturellement.' (340)

Croiset betrays his own presuppositions, however, when he speaks of Lucian's 'démonstration à faire': his Lucian is a *Lucien moraliste*; and he would have found it less easy to present his portrait of Lucian the crusader against wealth and power if he had inspected his author's rhetorical expedients more closely. His theory does not even stand up to the one test he gives it: in *Timon* he expects his moralist to make a grand climax to the debate between Ploutos and Timon.[47] When Lucian does nothing of the sort he is obliged to point out 'ce qu'il y a eu de capricieux et d'irréfléchi dans sa manière de composer'.[48]

Helm made a beginning when he noted that both *Dear. Iud.* and *Timon* fell into three scenes; but he is content to link this plan to that of 'Menippean' pieces which he regarded as contemporary.[49] Others [50] have only set out to show that from time to time Lucian follows the patterns of a rhetorical textbook, or adapts mannerisms from dialogue or Old Comedy. We need to examine his major dialogues side by side, to establish how far he was prepared to apply a fixed scheme of events.

(a) *Piscator*

The *Piscator* is a convenient starting-point. Lucian has used a fair cross-section of his repertoire here, and developed it at some length. If he did concern himself with arrangement at all, then a case like this would present him with a considerable challenge. Nor is there any risk that he lifted his dialogue entirely from a

---

47 *Timon* 37 f., Croiset 343.

48 Walz (*Geschichtliche Kenntnisse o.c.* 102) attempted to prove that Lucian's use of historical exempla is quite random. But the work she chose was the exceptional *pro Lapsu*—not only a hurried pièce d'occasion, but the kind of work where one could not possibly expect Lucian to 'arrange' his material: how does one assemble exactly the same number of historical anecdotes for the proper use of εὖ πράττειν, χαίρειν, and ὑγιαίνειν?

49 *PW* 1737, 1762.

50 E.g. Müller, *Eos* 32 (1930), 559-86; Bompaire 239-332.

single source: we are dealing with Lucian's own hybrid—an opening from Aristophanes and Eupolis, a paraphrase of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, and a Comic ending which looks like an afterthought.[51]

The sequence of events can be clearly articulated:

1-4:	A mob of angry philosophers runs Parrhesiades to earth.	*Introduction* I
3-4:	They fight a brief battle of quotations, before P. asks for an explanation.[52]	II
4-10:	P. offers his preliminary defence and asks to stand formal trial:	*Central Debate, Phase I*
11-12:	He tells of his vain search for philosophy.	Interlude
13-20:	Philosophy arrives, and interviews both sides.	*Central Debate, Phase II*
21-24:	The philosophers choose their spokesman.	Interlude
25-37:	*Agon* between Diogenes and P.	*Central Debate, Phase III*
38-39:	The trial concluded.	Interlude
40-41:	A proclamation against impostors.	
42-52:	P. finds methods for detecting exposing, and punishing impostors.	*'Exposure Scene'*

This scheme is artificial and arbitrary, but Lucian's purpose is straightforward enough: he has used a framework which enables him to concentrate on one facet of his repertoire at a time. In the introduction he has adapted scenes from a classical author. In the body of the dialogue he has disposed his 'subject' as a debate in three phases or panels, punctuated by brief interludes. Then come two stereotyped motifs: a proclamation[53] and an 'exposure scene',[54] where he appears to combine favourite themes into a fantastic scene.[55] This turns out not unlike the 'impostor-scenes' so characteristic of Old Comedy after the parabasis: so that as a whole the work reads like a perfunctory comic frame, surrounding a central *agon*; but Lucian has multiplied it by three to suit an age of rhetorical prose.

[51] See Helm, *LM* 297 ff., citing *Ach.* 280 ff., Eupolis' *Demoi* (Kock I. p. 279), and Aeschylus' *Eumenides*.

[52] Helm (*PW* 1756) groups 1-10 together; but there is a clear break between the style of the quickfire exchanges and P's long speech.

[53] *Supra* 104.

[54] *Supra* 107.

[55] For this episode, *supra* 39 f.

(b) *Timon*

Could he adapt so unwieldy a scheme to deal with some quite different subject? In *Timon* he deals at comparable length with the problems of wealth, a topic which has no ground whatever in common with *Piscator*. Yet the plan is all but identical:

1-6:	Timon's monologue against the gods.	*Introduction* I
7-11:	Hermes explains Timon's plight to Zeus.	II
11-19:	Zeus forces the unwilling Ploutos to return to Timon.	*Dialogue I*
20-30:	Hermes questions Ploutos on the way down to earth.	*Dialogue II*
31-33:	A brief encounter with Penia, who deserts Timon.	Interlude
34-40:	Hermes and Ploutos persuade Timon to accept wealth.	*Dialogue III*
41:	The treasure discovered.	Interlude
42-44:	Timon issues a private decree against impostors	*Proclamation*
		Exposure
45-58:	—and unmasks four pretenders.	*Scene*

Once more Lucian opens with an imitation, this time of a dramatic monologue; then three episodes of artificial rhetorical dialogue while the 'action' itself is at a standstill; and another exposure-scene. The subject-matter of the Timonlegend naturally excludes the sort of trial scene which Lucian contrives in *Piscator*: the misanthrope has to use make-believe (42 ff.) and numerous asides to the audience to introduce each impostor. But even here the detailed sequence of events is still very similar:

Timon:	*Piscator*:
42: T. thanks Pan for his deliverance from Poverty.	39: P. thanks Victory for his deliverance from the philosophers.
42 f.: T. puts out a proclamation which nobody hears.	40: Syllogism(!) puts out a proclamation which nobody hears.
45: He changes his plan and breaks his own law.	41: P. tries a diffeient approach and the response is tremendous.
45: The flatterers swarm up, lured by wealth.	42: The philosophers swarm up, lured by wealth.
46 ff.: T. drives off four flatterers.	47 f.: P. catches four philosopher-fish.
58: He resolves to continue stoning them.	52: He resolves to continue the pursuit with a branding-iron.

This comparison shows just how blatantly Lucian was prepared to use the same groundplan. Once *Timon* and *Piscator* are seen as variations on a common scheme, some curious features in the former fall into place. Bompaire explained the contradiction between Timon's behaviour before and after discovering his treasure as 'l'intrusion maladroite et toute mécanique d'un développement cynique', and there are now numerous theories on the exact balance between Comic and other elements in Lucian's synthetic Comedy.[56] In fact it is clear enough that he has set out to do the same thing in both dialogues. The outside frame contains the purely comic and fantastic material, while the three debates thus enclosed supply the element of *spoudaion* (in the case of *Timon* satire on the abuse of wealth). Lucian makes no great effort to achieve absolute cohesion here. It happens that in his collection of clichés on wealth the Old Comic, Cynic and rhetorical elements neatly overlap: he exploits this convergence of sources by working out the material at enormous length—with a personification of Ploutos (after Aristophanes), conventional attacks on wealth in the manner of diatribe, and an elaborate series of textbook similes.

Scholars have always been puzzled, however, by the short scene 34-40; and the *Quellenforscher* have always been tempted to see it as a mark of faulty abridgement. Hermes and Ploutos are at last face to face with Timon, and after only a short exchange he feels forced to accept wealth once more. Is this the remains of an original *agon*, a mere rhetorical display, or sheer miscalculation on Lucian's part? [57] Croiset argued that he had used up all the material on wealth and poverty in the first two scenes, and that he had to make do with what was left. But a glance at *Piscator* shows that he was well able to put a long elaborate debate in this position in the dialogue when he chose: there the third debate, between Diogenes and Parrhesiades, lasts from c. 25 to c. 37. Nor had Lucian run out of material in the present case—he had only to reserve some of the most elaborate similes from the first debate (11-19) to fill out the third one instead, or introduce some of the arguments about poverty which occur in *Gall.* 21 f.; and there are plenty of 'Attic' allusions there which would have been equally in place here. It is clear that he took another course by choice.

[56] Conveniently enumerated by Bompaire, 169 nn. (see also *supra* 83f.).

[57] Legrand *REA* 9 (1907), 142; Bompaire 254 f.; Croiset 341-3.

The shorter the scene, the better it serves as preparation for Timon's discovery of the treasure (40 f.). We have already seen that Lucian makes fun of Timon's conversion back to wealth: the misanthrope reacts to it in the same amusing way as Micyllus in *Gallus*.[58] By writing only a short scene beforehand Lucian still retains the third panel in his scheme, but makes the conversion even more melodramatic: Timon must not be won over by eloquence or reason; once Penia has deserted him, there must be as little persuasion as possible. The short scene also allows Lucian to make the most of the 'inconsistency' in Timon's character:[59] as a poor man he is brusque and reticent, and it is in character for him to allow Ploutos only a short plea without any rhetorical tricks (37); no sooner has he set eyes on gold than he is full of poetic effusions and rhetorical enactments (41 ff.). The drama of *Timon* falls neatly into a scheme, and still serves to display a large cross-section of Lucian's repertoire at the same time.

(c) *Gallus*

Much of the material in *Timon* and *Piscator* is superfluous to their 'plots', and Lucian's scheme gives him ample opportunity to digress. This has caused some disagreement in the analyses of *Gallus*.[60] But again Lucian's material and composition fall easily into the familiar plan:

1-5:	Micyllus' cock reveals that he is Pythagoras, and promises to describe his adventures.	*Introduction* I
5-8:	Micyllus remembers his dream and his first dinner.	II
9-11:	The dinner.	*Episode* 1a
12-14:	He then dreams of wealth, but Simon has inherited it.	Ib

[58] *Supra* 83 f.

[59] *Supra* 83 f.

[60] As usual Croiset (344 f.) admires Lucian's freedom and spontaneity: 'la composition ne cesse de se diversifier joyeusement. Les parties sérieuses et les parties plaisantes y alternent sans que le lecteur en ait conscience'. Helm (*LM* 332) saw the final scene as somewhat tenuously tied to the rest (28 ff.), while Schwartz (*Biographie* 86) divided the piece into three segments, with a different literary influence in each. But by placing the divisions at cc. 20 and 27 he gives Lucian a disproportionately long opening section: he merely avoids analysis by calling it 'deux récits volontairement entremêlés sur les metempsychoses de Pythagore et sur le dîner (suivi d'un songe) de Micylle'.

15-20:	Pythagoras' transformations.	*Episode* II
21-23:	P. cites the benefits of poverty as opposed to wealth.	*Episode* IIIa
24-26:	Both recount the perils of power.	IIIb
28:	Pythagoras offers to make a dramatic revelation with his magic feather,	*Exposure*
29-33:	and Micyllus exposes four impostors (Simon, Gnipho, Eucrates and his wife).	*Scene*

In the introduction Lucian has developed his picture of the philosopher-cock and the cobbler separately, like Timon and Zeus in *Timon*. Once again the bulk of satirical material fills the centre: and as in *Timon* the first and third conversations consist of long complementary speeches with a section of more informal conversation in between. Pythagoras' account (15-20) of himself is similar to Ploutos' self-portrait (*Timon* 20-30): both are loose patchworks of 'Cynic' and rhetorical commonplaces—Ploutos was lame and dreamlike, blind or clearsighted, masked and pursued by lovers; Pythagoras turns out to be a succession of 'diatribe' types: warrior, naughty philosopher, king, pauper, woman and animal.[61] As in *Piscator*, on the other hand, Lucian combines the element of Old Comedy in the exposure-scene with a motif which belongs rather to fantasy.[62] Because Micyllus is invisible when he visits the impostors, there is no place for trials or proclamations. But Lucian still keeps the number of impostors at four: and to do so he seems to introduce a new character specially: the usurper Gnipho appears only in c. 30, while the rest were 'prepared' in Micyllus' speech at 9-14.[63]

(d) *Convivium*

Each of the three examples so far depends on fantastic turns to the 'plot': this was a law of the genre in Old Comedy, and Lucian continues it in his two 'Menippean' hybrids. But could he adapt it to imitation of Plato? He borrows the plan of Plato's *Symposium* for the series of speeches in *Philopseudes*; but his own

[61] Cf. the range of types in *Katapl.* 6 ff., 21; *Icar.* 12, 16.

[62] Bompaire 697, cf. Helm *LM* 332 f.

[63] Lucian could in fact have used the philosopher Thesmopolis (10 f.) at this point. He may have felt that he had already attacked the immorality of philosophers enough at Pythagoras' own expense (19); and it is an easy move from miser to moneylender.

Convivium follows the comic branch of symposium tradition[64] and concentrates on a succession of farcical incidents. No one has thought it worthwhile to analyse these unconnected happenings ending in chaos, but once more the events can be grouped in a distinctive way:

1-4:	Opening frame: Philo persuades Lycinus to describe the incident.	*Introduction* I
5-10:	Lycinus sets the scene.	II
11-19:	The philosophers start disgracing themselves separately, but only Alcidamas shows signs of violence.	*Episode* I
20:	Dionicus' story.	Interlude.
21-27:	Hetoemocles' letter.	
28-33:	Heated argument among the schools.	*Episode* IIa
34-35:	Lucian's own reflections.	
36-37:	The argument continues.	IIb
39:	Ion's speech.	Interlude
40-41:	Histiaeus' song.	
42-45:	A full-scale brawl.	*Episode* III
46-47:	Alcidamas is caught when the lights come on: humiliation for Dionysodorus, Ion, and Zenothemis.	*Exposure Scene*
48:	Closing frame.	

Once more Lucian sets the scene with classical imitation, naturally of Platonic dialogue. It would have fitted the symposium tradition well enough if he had written three debates, as in *Timon* or *Piscator*; but it is part of the fun to make the philosophers' actions speak louder than words: he reduces the speeches to interludes, and the main interest on what happens in between. Lucian has now gathered the incidents into three phases: each represents a new escalation in the conflict, and he has arranged the 'literary' events in two pairs to mark them off. In effect this offers the same threefold central section as before, while Lucian still retains the mixture of speech and incident proper to the genre. The first two speeches provide the very reverse of 'Platonic' subject-matter: Lucian's doctor Dionicus tells a racy novella in place of Eryximachus' dull abstractions;[65] and the reported speech in Lucian's version is

[64] See Bompaire 314 ff. and notes.

[65] *Conv.* 20/*Symp.* 186A ff.

a shocking message of hatred from Hetoemocles, in contrast to Socrates' account of the sublime discourse of Diotima.[66]

Even the exposure-scene can be fitted into this unlikely context: the last major event in Plato's version is the speech in which Alcibiades discourses on Socrates' continence at night on the couch, and his military prowess; here Alcidamas the Cynic displays his mettle in a drunken fight, and is finally found with the flute-girl.[67] In this shorter exposure-scene Lucian still singles out only four impostors (out of a possible eight) for criticism. As in *Gallus* there is no pair of proclamations to introduce the last scene: this motif has already done duty as the second interlude, only a few paragraphs before—Ion makes an outrageous toast, and Histiaeus rivals it with an even worse one.

(e) *Some other variations*

A number of other major dialogues follow the scheme, with greater variation in the details. In *J. Trag.* the central section is the usual debate in three phases:[68] after Hermes Agoraeus corrects his proclamation (33) Lucian closes with the usual exposure-scene. The clouds are rolled away to reveal a scene on earth; and the gods and the Stoics emerge as empty impostors. But there is no succession of short encounters as in *Timon*, *Piscator* or *Gallus*: Lucian has added a debate between two men, with gods as spectators, occupying close on half the dialogue (34-53). Again with good reason: such a scene is similar to the long debate between the poets, with Dionysus and Pluto as spectators, which dominates the second half of Aristophanes' *Frogs*:[69] Lucian has tagged on a Comic scene, just as he draws on the concluding scene of *Birds* or *Acharnians* for the end of *Timon*.[70]

In *Bis Acc.* he elongates his final scene still further. The plot is an obvious blend of *Timon* and *Piscator*;[71] but Lucian compresses the usual sequence of happenings (flights from heaven, arrivals on earth) into the introduction (1-11); he now expands the set of trials which would make up an exposure scene: the

[66] *Conv.* 22 ff./*Symp.* 201 ff.
[67] *Conv.* 46/*Symp.* 214 ff.
[68] A long muddle about seating, 7-14; Zeus and Momus make long counter-balancing speeches, 15-23; the debate becomes a free-for-all, 24-32.
[69] Lucian draws on this scene elsewhere, *Neky.* 19, cf. *supra* 140.
[70] Helm *LM* 189, cf. *Ach.* 719 ff.
[71] Cf. Helm *PW* 1732.

first three scenes (Academy v. Drunkenness 13-18; Stoa v. Pleasure 19-22; the deferred cases 23-25) now form the usual three-phase middle section, while Lucian's own trials (25-35) are reserved for the climax, corresponding to the great debate in *J. Trag.* 34-53. He expands or contracts his schemes of composition as easily as he expands the themes themselves.

The fantastic narrative *Icaromenippus* fits just as easily into the scheme, though it would have been natural for Lucian to abandon himself here to a mere chain of events:[72] there are two introductory panels, in which Lucian introduces the speakers, then Menippus condemns the philosophers' speculations (1-3, 4-9); next three major episodes on Menippus' trip to heaven (the flight 10-13, a view of mankind 15-19, and the interview with Zeus 22-29), punctuated by two minor interludes, when Menippus meets Empedocles (13 f.) and the moon (20 f.); then the usual proclamation (Zeus speaks against philosophers) and condemnation-scene (the gods agree and debate their punishment).

These examples are sufficient to show that Lucian does have a scheme, and any of his authors can be made to fit it. The framework is far from rigid, but it is clear that he does not strike out anew when he turns to a new subject. Lucian was once hailed as a literary Prometheus: he is also a literary Procrustes.

---

[72] For the parallel sequence of events in *Neky.*, see *supra* 139 f.

CHAPTER TEN

ARRANGEMENT OF THEMES II: TYPICAL PROBLEMS

Lucian has a scheme to fall back on, and plainly enjoys introducing certain motifs at every opportunity: it will be no surprise if some dialogues turn out bizarre and overloaded. Scholars have criticised a number of works because they contain an unexpected sequence of events, or because there are loose connexions in the argument; and this has often been an excuse for arguing that Lucian has made a clumsy epitome of a lost original. But where we can show that he was working out a variation on his scheme, it is just as possible that he was imitating himself, and pressing his plan into service without adapting it fully to its new context.

(a) *Kataplous*

The composition of this dialogue has a special interest: Helm [1] gave it a key role in his attempt to reconstruct Menippus' lost *Nekyia*, and M. I. Levy [2] used a similar approach in his attempt to reconstruct Heraclides' *Abaris*. There are already adequate reasons for doubting their conclusions.[3] But the inconsistencies they found in the dialogue have still to be explained: the philosopher Cyniscus and the cobbler Micyllus duplicate each other; Micyllus appears almost halfway through (14) *ex abrupto*; Lucian gives both characters a separate trial, and Micyllus rather inconspicuously drops out again when Cyniscus presses for the trial of the tyrant Megapenthes. Helm therefore condemns Micyllus as an inept addition by Lucian himself. But the difficulties disappear if we apply the usual structure:

1-4:	Hermes arrives,	*Introduction*	I
5-7:	and checks the corpses		II
8-13:	Megapenthes appeals to Clotho	*Episode*	I

[1] *LM* 63-79. Croiset (65) dismisses it merely as an enlarged *Dialogue of the Dead*.

[2] *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, Paris 1927, 119 f.

[3] See B. MacCarthy, *YCS* 4 (1934), 42; Bompaire 371 ff.

14-19:	Micyllus appeals to Clotho	II
19-23:	Micyllus and Cyniscus en route	III
23-4:	Cyniscus on trial	*Exposure*
25:	Micyllus on trial	*Scene*
25-29:	Megapenthes on trial	

Lucian has used the conversation between Micyllus and Clotho to serve as the second of his three central episodes. If he had used Cyniscus over again, the result would have been simply to prolong the dialogue already in progress, and the episode-division would have been less distinct. In *Piscator* Lucian introduces Philosophy at a similar point in the proceedings (14): her appearance starts a new conversation, and the journey to the scene of the trial can begin. The same outline of events applies here, when Micyllus appears just as Charon's boat is about to depart. Moreover Micyllus' arrival is parallel to other surprise encounters: at *Icar.* 13-14 Empedocles presents himself to Menippus; and at *Conv.* 12 Alcidamas arrives uninvited—both at similar points in their respective dialogues. Nor do Micyllus and Cyniscus really overlap: this is an opportunity for Lucian to exploit the contrast between rich and poor, as well as between tyranny and freedom, and there is no reason why Megapenthes should not have two opposites. And Lucian needs *two* strangers in Hades for the reminiscence of Ar. *Ran.* 285 ff. (22): Tisiphone frightens Micyllus and Cyniscus as Empusa surprises Dionysus and Xanthus. Helm [4] complained that the trial of Micyllus was superfluous; but Lucian multiplies trial-scenes with no apparent inhibitions elsewhere.[5] And here as in *Conv.* 39-41 he has found a place for the motif of 'counter-proclamation' which so often precedes the final exposure scene: the dead proclaim their miseries, and Hermes invites Micyllus to 'answer' with a dirge of his own (20). By placing this motif further back in the dialogue, Lucian has found room for another standard feature of his scheme; and at the same time he adds a reminiscence of *Ran.* 221 ff., where Dionysus parodies the frogs' chorus *during* his voyage.[6] There is simply nothing in this dialogue that we have not come to expect.

---

[4] *LM* 66.

[5] *VH* II.7 ff.; *D. Mort.* 10.5 ff.; *Bis Acc.* 13 ff.

[6] Harmon adopts an equally arbitrary approach when trying to find a 'Menippean' original for *Nekyomanteia* (*LCL* IV,71). His argument amounts

(b) *Saturnalia*

At first sight the *Saturnalia* looks more eccentric: a brief dialogue (1-9), a collection of laws (10-18), and some correspondence arising out of them (19-39). There are numerous difficulties: the laws run on much longer than any of Lucian's other mock-decrees; Lucian seems to change the subject from Cronos' priest's own ambitions to the interests of the poor; and instead of giving Cronos himself the last word by way of a closing frame for the dialogue, he suddenly introduces a letter from the rich. And even allowing for the problems involved in writing a fictitious correspondence, there is an enormous amount of clumsy repetition—all the more marked when Lucian usually handles the theme of rich against poor with such assurance.[7] Helm[8] blames Lucian for attempting to contaminate Menippus' Ἐπιστολαὶ κεκομψευμέναι ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν θεῶν προσώπου with material from Roman Satire; Bompaire explains the sequence in terms of rhetorical practice: 'les parties sont rhétoriques (ou essentiellement rhétoriques) comme ici, ou comiques et rhétoriques comme dans le groupe *Pêcheur-Sectes*, et l'on peut discuter sur l'origine de semblables compositions: nous croyons qu'elle n'est pas à chercher du côté de lointaines trilogies scéniques, mais dans un développement de la tendance scolaire à opposer ou à répéter plaidoyers, semonces, éloges' (293). There is no lack of parallels in Plutarch, Aristides, or Maximus of Tyre:[9] but in some of the cases Bompaire cites the parts are completely separate and self-contained, whereas here they are not. There cannot be a break after the opening dialogue (9), since the priest has already promised to write up the laws which follow: this means that the heading χρονοσόλων prefaced to c. 10 is a subtitle and not the start of an entirely self-contained new work. This has not prevented scholars from regarding the correspondence as a separate piece (19 f.), with its own heading Ἐπιστολαὶ χρονικαί. Croiset took this view, and J. Schwartz attempted to date the two halves to separate Saturnalia.[10] But if χρονοσόλων is a subtitle it is reasonable to infer that the second label has the same function. And Lucian has an obvious

---

to saying that a satire on wealth should not include an attack on philosophers as well!

[7] *Gall. passim*; *Neky.* 14, 20; *Timon.*

[8] *LM* 225.

[9] Bompaire 294 n. 1.

[10] *Biographie* 93 f. One cannot argue against this that 1-18 ends rather abruptly; so, unfortunately, does 1-39.

reason for using subtitles within a single piece. This is the only dialogue where it is necessary for him to indicate a lapse of time: he has to show that Zeus resumes office and Cronos' laws break down, since only then can the poor complain (19 ff.). And the normal technique of dialogue has no way of coping with the problem: the simplest solution was to allow an apparent break and a fresh heading. It will be clear that the work was conceived as a single whole if we compare the sequence of parts to Lucian's usual plan:

(a) 1-9 corresponds to the usual comic introduction; as often there are two separate topics: the priest is told the limits of Cronos' powers (1-4), and enquires rather too closely into his novel reasons for abdicating (5-9).

(b) The three sets of Laws form the usual central section: the characteristic tripartite division could not be clearer.

(c) The four letters fall into two groups of two (Cronos and the poor (19-30)/Cronos and the rich (31-39): two separately developed *syncrises* between wealth and poverty. Even a set of letters is made to serve as an exposure scene: the hidden crimes of rich and poor alike come to light. (There is of course no place for the motif of 'counter-proclamation' here: the three lawgivings are themselves a full development of this motif).

As a whole this ensemble looks like a variation on *Bis Accusatus*. In both cases Lucian compresses the material of a complete dialogue to form the introduction.[11] In *Bis Acc.* the central section comprises trials of ancient worthies; here he has written a similar series of laws. And the two *syncrises* in letter form correspond to the two separate *syncrises* of Lucian's trial, first against Rhetoric, then against Dialogue. There is also an important cross-reference between the two works: in *Bis Acc.* 1-3 Zeus complains that he is too overworked to run the universe; in *Sat.* 5-9 Cronos gives similar reasons for resigning.

In these two dialogues, then, Lucian has once more developed his usual groundplan along the same lines, despite the very different subject-matter. Since *Bis Accusatus* is as self-consistent as one can expect works of this kind to be, it would certainly be tempting to accept that Lucian wrote it first and then worked out *Saturnalia* along the same lines; and that in the latter he included a clever complement to the satire of Providence which opens *Bis. Acc.* But the reverse order is always possible.

[11] *Bis Acc.* 1-13/*Pisc.*, *Fugit.*; *Saturnalia* 1-9/*J. Conf.* cf. *Hes.*

The difficulties arise from the theme itself: in the other 'Menippean' works Lucian uses divine machinery to hold the usual sections together: divine messengers, magic feathers or allegorical women link one scene to the next, instituting trials, opening doors or conducting investigations. But Cronos has resigned his powers, and is confined to writing letters and conversing in person with his priest. The result is that Lucian has only very limited dramatic possibilities at his command; and without the relief of comic dialogue his 'Cynic' material—especially in the second half—becomes difficult to sustain.

(c) *Anacharsis*

Compared with *Saturnalia* Lucian's major 'Platonic' dialogues are self-explanatory; and this has encouraged scholars to search only for traces of rhetorical schemes.[12] In *Anacharsis* they have not been able to find very much even of those. But it is still possible to distinguish three phases in the debate:

20-30: Solon makes a protreptic speech on the benefits of Greek education, and especially (24 ff.) gymnastics.

31-36: Anacharsis points out the weakness of Greek defences in war, but Solon puzzles him with rhetorical comparisons (35-36), and he returns to his old question (9) about prizes.

36-38: Solon makes a second long speech, this time praising Sparta as well as Athens.

This arrangement is similar to the middle section of *Gall.*: two long units with an interlude of dialogue between. The rest of the work conforms to the standard plan: Lucian expands the introduction to include two standard features of Platonic 'scenery': the discussion takes its starting-point from a gymnasium, as in *Charmides* or *Lysis* (1-16); Lucian's second panel imitates the walk to the Ilissus at *Phaedr.* 229A f., and the dialogue drifts from athletics into Greek institutions. After the prolonged introduction, he has reduced the exposure scene we have come to expect

---

[12] Müller (*Eos* 32, 1930, 573 f.) analysed the argument of *Anacharsis*, which he regarded as largely protreptic in content: cc. 20-30 are labelled *tractatio*, 34-37 *refutatio* of Anacharsis' objections. But this cuts straight across the argument: Müller cuts Solon off in the middle of an explanation about why the Greeks wrestle with dust (38). Bompaire marks off 20-31 as the central point of interest, but dismisses the rest as 'trop décousu pour qu'on puisse reconnaître un plan rhétorique quelconque'.

to no more than a subtle hint. There is no room for any fantastic scenario within 'Platonic' conventions; he has to be content with reducing the victim to a state of *aporia*. Anacharsis therefore exposes the weakness of Solon's smug defence when he uncovers the fact that Lycurgus made laws which could not apply to himself (39); accordingly he recommends whipping for the Athenians and hellebore for the Spartans. We have already seen that Lucian is on Anacharsis' side. He has applied his usual scheme, and this makes it doubly clear that Solon is the impostor.

(d) *Navigium*

Here again Lucian adopts the Platonic motif of a dialogue-promenade,[13] and this time attaches it to three wishes by Lycinus' friends. Schissel[14] treats the work as a group of tales like *Philopseudes* or *Toxaris*, and tries to force it into a similar framework. U. Moricca[15] severely criticised this analysis, but left nothing in its place, believing like Croiset that Lucian attains a 'significato artistico e morale' without planning of this kind.

The general outline is beyond dispute: three friends meet in the course of the long introduction, then each tells a tale followed by wry comments from Lycinus. The opening falls decisively into two, as usual:[16]

1-9: The three friends have lost Adimantus, and fill in time by talking about a newly-arrived ship.
10-17: A. appears, and the conversations drifts from ship to wishes.

Lucian uses this twofold exposition in other 'Platonic' dialogues.[17]

---

[13] Husson, (Commentary), Paris 1970, 9.

[14] *Novellenkränze Lukians* 23 n. 1; 32-38.

[15] *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 42 (1914), 327-33.

[16] Schissel broke down this introduction ,and made each of the friends' speeches (5-6, 7-9, 12-13) correspond to a tale. It would not have been surprising for Lucian to construct a parallel scheme in this way; but Moricca showed that there is no real parallel between any character's opening conversation and his subsequent tale. There are other objections: it would be quite natural for Lucian to divide his account of the ship (5 ff.) at random between the speakers; and Adimantus' contribution (12 f.) is too far away from the others to be regarded as any part of the series. Instead it anticipates the wish he is going to make immediately afterwards, and serves as a link between the introduction and the wishes themselves (18 ff.). Schissel was evidently misled by the sheer length of the introduction; but in the *Anacharsis*, where Lucian's preamble is of comparable scale (1-19), he makes no attempt to relate it point by point to the material which follows.

[17] *Philops.* 1-5/6-10; *Conv.* 1-4/5-10; *Anach.* 1-16/17-19.

And in both halves he combines motifs from his other prologues: *Kataplous* opens with Clotho in conversation with Charon at the quayside waiting for Hermes, and only when he arrives is the main theme introduced (3); *Gallus* opens with Micyllus dreaming about wealth, but he is disturbed by his companion the cock, who engages with him in dialogue about wealth (1-7). So here the friends at the quayside have lost Adimantus, and interrupt his dream about wealth before the main subject is introduced (11 f.). Lucian has included an element of formal ecphrasis (5-9) which has a bearing on the eventual subject, a technique he also uses in *Toxaris* (6). The lengthy introduction arises out of this blend of material—suitably decorated with Platonic reminiscence—and there is no need to press Schissel's scheme.

In the rest of the dialogue, Lycinus answers each 'wish' with destructive comments, just as Tychiades replies to each tale in *Philops.* But Bompaire seems puzzled by the fact that there are only three 'contes', so that he is cautious about grouping *Navig. Tox.* and *Philops.* together as collections of anecdotes. In fact none of the wishes are tales at all: in each case he has assembled a collection of diatribe clichés—on wealth, world domination, and ambitions to rival the gods; each is presented as a fantastic dream instead of an argument, before Lycinus proceeds to demolish it. The number is particularly convenient: it corresponds to the popular motif of the three wishes,[18] and this would be appropriate in a dialogue which includes Lucian's version of the 'Ring of Gyges'.[19] But in both cases popular fantasy has a strong literary appeal: not only has Plato used the myth, but the whole plan of the *Republic* is in essence Socrates' answer to three main interlocutors, a fact which did not escape the teachers of *progymnasmata.*[20] Now Lucian opens with a walk from the Piraeus in imitation of the opening of the *Republic* (327A f.), and borrows the name Adimantus for one of the interlocutors: it is reasonable to suppose that he would take any other opportunities to echo the same model. But his formula is also found in routine moral anecdote: Aelian [21] mentions three friends who want to live for

---

[18] D. Köfler, *Aberglaube und Zauberei in Lukians Schriften*, Diss. Innsbruck, 1949, 151.

[19] 42 ff./*R* II.359D ff.

[20] Theon, Spengel II. p. 70.

[21] *VH* II.34 (So Husson, independently).

varying numbers of years; a fourth (Epicharmus) rebukes them for their folly.

The result is that once more Lucian has produced three debates on 'diatribe' themes, as in the central portion of *Timon*. After he has disposed of the individual wishes, Lycinus condemns all of them together (46); and in his last few words he reveals that his idle dreamers are καὶ ταῦτα φιλοσοφίαν ἐπαινοῦντες. For Schissel this is merely the concluding frame. But it also serves instead of an exposure-scene, with the real scandal reserved till last: there is no place for fantastic revelations here: Lycinus' task is to bring his three victims down to earth. The proportions overall are similar to those of *Anacharsis*: again the introduction is at its most elaborate, the exposure reduced to a surprise hint. And as in *Anach.*, the middle of the three main sections is a ludicrous battle-scene placed between two portions of 'diatribe' material: Anacharsis imagines himself storming the Athenians single-handed (33); Samippus dreams that he can advance to Babylon like Alexander with only three friends (*Navig.* 34).

Where does Lucian's emphasis lie? Radermacher [22] regarded Samippus' tale as the principal episode (28-38): it is certainly the most vivid and elaborate, and in *Toxaris* Lucian grouped his Scythian tales round a central episode, which like this one is a romantic and military adventure. Others [23] argue however that the three tales are arranged so as to be progressively more far-fetched, so that Timolaus' rather shorter speech (41-44) is the real climax. This is what happens in *Philopseudes*,[24] where Lucian groups the large-scale visions of Hades (22-26) in the centre, but reserves the most absurd adventure till last, and then loses his patience with the philosophers; and the last tale in *Philops.* combines elements from the others.[25] Lucian has used a similar technique here: Timolaus has wished a wish which will secure him both Samippus' armies and Adimantus' gold whenever he pleases (44). Lucian himself makes it quite clear that he is using this arrangement here: Lycinus invites Timolaus to outdo the others (41), and forecasts that he will have the worst fall (46).

[22] *WSt* 33 (1911), 224.

[23] Schissel *o.c.* 38; Moricca *o.c.* 327; Bompaire 465 f.; cf. Husson I.10.

[24] See the analysis in *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* c. II.

[25] It contains both magic messengers *and* the spirit which moves of its own accord, thus 'improving' on the absurdities in the first tales; and it has a new and trivial twist—a mere pestle turns the house into chaos.

One problem remains: is Lycinus Lucian himself? Bompaire (593) claims that the author's viewpoint is ambiguous: 'il n'est pas du tout sûr que Lycinos, ce rabat-joie, soit le porte-parole de L.' But in all the other closing scenes where philosophers are being judged, it is either Lucian or his spokesman who is doing so. As Parrhesiades he is to carry out a purge; his patron Menippus brings news of their doom; and in *Philopseudes* he reports the fantastic nonsense told by philosophers with the same relish as here, but still rejects it as rubbish in the end.[26] And it is all the more incredible that Lucian should bestow the name Lycinus—the Hellenised version of his own name—on someone whose views were not his own. It is perfectly consistent with Lucian's literary opportunism that he enjoys both elaborating on nonsense for its own sake and demolishing it.

(e) *Prometheus seu Caucasus*

Caster attacked this minor satire on the Olympians for its incoherent planning, and his criticisms have gone unanswered. Scholars have found the *Prometheus* difficult to classify at all because of its intermediate length, midway between the miniatures and the Menippeans.[27] But if we take Prometheus' defence itself as the centrepiece and all the rest as the frame,[28] then we have a familiar Lucianic arrangement.

1-3:	Hermes and Hephaestus finish their task of stringing up Prometheus.	*Introduction* I
4-6:	Hermes agrees to give Prometheus a mock-trial: if he admits the charge, however, there will be no need for any prosecution speech.	II
7-19:	*Prometheus' defence on three counts*	
7-10:	The bones covered in fat. (Zeus is petty-minded to raise it, 7).	I

[26] *Pisc.* 52; *Icar.* 34; *Philops.* 7-38.

[27] Helm (*LM* 181) discussed it with the *D. Deor.*; but it is much longer than any of the miniatures (except the so-called *Dear. Iud.*), and its content is also rather different: an elaborate sophistic display by Prometheus. Müller (*Eos* 32, 1930, 560 f.) at least analysed its rhetorical features, but without relating it to Lucian's own practice.

[28] Bompaire (248) adds Hermes' speech to Prometheus' reply and finds 'une esquisse de tétralogie à la mode d'Antiphon'. In fact this speech is only long enough to allow Hermes to repeat the charges (6) and refuse to elaborate on them.

11-17:	The creation of man. (Otherwise there would be no-one to admire the gods (15) so that in effect Zeus was powerless until P. gave him man to offer worship).	II
18-19:	The theft of fire. (Since there is plenty, and Zeus does not need it, the implication is that he is petty-minded once again).	III
20:	Hermes admits that Zeus is really the god on trial.	
21:	Trouble ahead for Zeus.	

Caster (*Pensée* 203) objects that Lucian has not made his meaning clear enough: Hermes sums up (20) that Prometheus has accused Zeus while pretending to defend himself, but Caster maintains that this verdict does not apply to the whole dialogue, and that there are only isolated charges in 7 and 17. But it is clear from the table that Lucian has planned the defence in the usual three sections, and has strongly implied a criticism of Zeus in each of them. As in *Anacharsis* or *Navigium*, he brings the real culprit into the open only at the last moment, so that again there is just a hint of an exposure scene. By this arrangement he both maintains his scheme and keeps the dialogue self-consistent.[29]

Lucian claimed the 'Menippean' group as his own special blend (*Bis Acc.* 33), and it is not surprising that he should have found a working plan to match his new form. But he also produced a number of occasional pieces—mostly invective—in which he had to do more than piece together imitations of his favourite authors on a stereotyped plan. He had to take account of circumstances,

[29] Caster raises similar objections about the consistency of Lucian's attacks in *Deor. Conc.* (*Pensée* 344). He is puzzled by Lucian's distinction between legitimate gods and others, and is surprised to find oracle-mongers listed with the foreign gods (12). But Lucian simply divides the victims into three classes—as so often (4-8: promoted bastards with demi-god status; 9-12: falsely registered divinities, which includes 'divine' oracles as well as foreign gods; 13: abstractions). Lucian's rather facile 'analysis' coincides neatly with his usual way of dividing dialogues. Nor need Caster object that Momus' decree includes a clause (about 'demarcation') which does not occur in the preceding debate (14). Lucian tries to make his mock decrees as comprehensive (and pompous) as possible (cf. the similar irrelevances at *Sat.* 15 f., *Timon* 43). This satire, then, should not be singled out as an 'ouvrage mal réfléchi, comme une fantaisie hâtive sans unité profonde'—any more than any other work which embodies Lucian's techniques.

and may have had to work quickly in response to insults or current scandals. Bompaire tends to assume that such works were produced completely at random, and he looks for little more than 'la répétition à peine ordonnée où tout l'effort porte sur le détail de la mise en œuvre' (472). But we have already noticed that some of the contents of such works are suspect, and that Lucian can 'translate' his clichés into contemporary events. Did he try to adapt his schemes of composition as well? The question throws still more light on these attacks; the more artificial Lucian's plan, the less spontaneous and authentic his contents.

In *Peregrinus* Lucian's account is undoubtedly tied to a real event. But his presentation of it has to be seen once more in terms of his own work. He has put the bulk of material into a long rhetorical attack (8-30), which corresponds broadly to the long central sections in the imaginative works; and he places many of the familiar trappings on either side of it. Again two panels of introduction: greetings to Cronius (1-2) and a preliminary speech by Theagenes which Lucian says he overheard (3-6), and which enables him to set the scene. What happens afterwards is still more stereotyped. Lucian's long speech ends with a pair of contrasting oracles (29-31): we are reminded of the proclamation and counter-proclamation which usually follow the central debates. Peregrinus is then caught out (32-34): the mob calls his bluff and holds him to his promise to commit suicide. This corresponds to the frequent assembly scene in which Lucian condemns impostors. The suicide then follows in chronological order. But Lucian finally tails off again into a set of random incidents. He threatens the Cynics at the pyre (37), fools one of Peregrinus' disciples (39), catches Peregrinus himself in the midst of a scandal (43), and reports a case of his cowardice (44)—four isolated incidents. This ensemble is close to the four impostor-scenes so frequent in the imaginative dialogues. It would obviously be difficult to translate a real event more closely into the pattern of *Timon* and *Piscator*: it is a significant comment on Lucian's methods that the only event foreign to his usual arrangement is the suicide he claims to be reporting!

The *Pseudologista* could scarcely be more different from *Peregrinus* in its subject-matter—a defence of the word ἀποφράς, and abuse of a rival who laughed at Lucian for using it. Yet once again we have the long central section (10-24), marked off by two

introductory panels: threats against the rival (1-4); and an extra character brought in to set the scene (4-9). At the other end we have a mock trial by tongue and beard (25), again tailing off into more scandalous revelations. One notes that the tongue and beard here come at the same place as the trial by bed and lamp in *Kataplous*. And an anonymous stranger interrupts Theagenes at the same point as Lucian laughed at the Pseudologist (*Peregr.* 7, *Pseudolog.* 7). There is of course no question of careful construction. But replies in the heat of the moment clearly called for prefabricated material and arrangement: in Lucian's hands a ritual suicide and a slip of the tongue begin to look remarkably alike.

There is just as much artifice in the more formal pamphlets, where Lucian's attack is less urgent—*de Mercede Conductis*, *Lexiphanes*, *Eunuchus*. Even when Lucian describes a 'day in the life of' a Roman household, he must still have his exposure scene at the end: the philosopher is thrown out after a scandal; then Lucian tags on an ecphrasis after Cebes, in which his victim is handed down the line of allegorical figures to his final punishment.[30] In the *Eunuchus* we have the usual dialogue frame, the long central debate, then the surprise intervention to expose Bagoas, which sets off an inquiry into his immorality.[31] Again any semblance of a real event is twisted into an all too familiar framework. *Lexiphanes* seems most grotesque of all: Lucian has only to allow one of his usual openings (the bore inspired) to drag on until it is time for the exposure-scene—(Lexiphanes throws up his worst Hyperatticisms at once, and Lycinus gives him his lecture on correct usage).[32] Such curiosities are really improvised rather than composed: but we can still identify the distinctive elements.

Lucian's pamphlets, then, can be as artificial as his fantastic dialogues. No two works are arranged exactly alike; but he clearly used existing works of his own to supply him with the outlines for new ones; and by substituting one episode for another as required, he could manipulate two very different sets of material into the same layout. The scheme of *Piscator* is the most typical; but there is no need to suspect that Lucian worked to any rigid *Dreiteilungsprinzip*, or took any satisfaction from using a 'con-

[30] *Merc. Cond.* 42.
[31] 1-3/4-9/10-13.
[32] 1-15/16-21/22-25.

cealed' master-plan; he simply found a useful framework which happened to solve—or circumvent—some artistic problems. He claimed to have blended Dialogue, Comedy, and 'Menippus' together, and took some satisfaction in his technique.[33] And he was faced with the problem of arranging these diverse sources, along with the inevitable rhetorical clichés, in a way which would avoid monotony. At the same time most compositions had to be organised with some satiric purpose in view. The plan he so often preferred answers these requirements. The threefold middle section allows him to secure some kind of contrast: he will insert a comic dialogue between two serious 'diatribe'-style monologues; a serious interlude of 'diatribe' material between two comic narratives;[34] or a fantastic battle-scene between two fantastic meditations, or between two serious explanations.[35] Or he can arrange two debates, one on high, one below, with a casual conversation en route; or a narrative report between two debates.[36] Where there are no such contrasting 'blocks' of material, he can still divide the proceedings into three stages.[37] In whatever circumstances Lucian first used this technique, we can say that he makes little effort to abandon it; and once it has become a working method, he does not hesitate to maintain it by expanding material or inserting digressions to fit.

His other means of securing variety is to contrast the central section of the dialogue with the frame: in his 'Platonic' pieces he begins with clear hints of a well-known dialogue, but the treatment that follows turns out to be a travesty of the original: *Philops.* begins as a bedside scene after *Phaedo* 60B ff.: but the περὶ ψυχῆς which follows is a collection of ghost-stories! *Navig.* begins as a walk to the Piraeus, after *R* 327A: but Lucian's περὶ πολιτείας is concerned with the dreams of three different kinds of tyrant! Plato's *Symposium* is the setting for discourses on love; Lucian's is the frame for deeds of hatred. Where he uses an Old Comic opening, he can follow it with quite unrelated 'Cynic' material: scenes from Ar. *Pax.* lead to an anti-intellectual attack on philosophers; those from *Ran.* and *Nub.* to attacks on wealth; or

[33] *Bis Acc.* 33; *Zeuxis* 2.
[34] *Gall.* 15-20/*Icar.* 15-19.
[35] *Navig.* 28-38/*Anach.* 31 ff.
[36] *Timon, Piscator* cf. *Fugit., Dear. Iud.*; *J. Trag.* 15-18.
[37] *Prometheus, Bis Acc., Saturnalia, Convivium.*

the setting of Aeschylus' *PV* forms the frame for a sophistic epideixis! [38]

With these two means of contrast and a fixed scheme Lucian is able to maintain interest in any one dialogue.[39] The final scenes he appends to them merely ring the changes on ways of confounding his opponents, by proclamations, trials, decrees, revelations, or some combination. The satirist has always to be seen to win—and he has an opportunity to display yet another section of his repertoire as he does so.[40]

So far we have seen Lucian working his variations on themes, on groups of themes, or on the layout of a whole dialogue. But even whole groups of dialogues can be viewed as variations on a formula.[41] The miniatures show us what to expect. Lucian has written three *Dialogues of the Dead* on Alexander the Great. Two of them are arranged as (almost) parallel *syncrises*. Alexander pleads on behalf of his own achievements against Philip (14), and in much the same way against Hannibal (12). But in the

---

[38] *Icar.*; *Neky.* 19, *Gall.* 7 ff.; *Prom. Cauc.*

[39] There is also some artistic point in dividing the introduction into two panels. Lucian has first to introduce characters, and scenery (if any); but after that he often allows himself another 'panel' by way of diversion before starting on the main subject. This usually takes the form of a descriptive set-piece: a 'Scythian' ecphrasis, *Tox.* 6; a ship and storm-scene, *Navig.* 5-9; or a stereotyped catalogue: philosophy nation by nation, *Fugit.* 6-11; miniature doxography, *Icar.* 4-9, *Neky.* 3-5; a superfluous discussion of philosophy, *Bis Acc.* 5-11; catalogues of philosophers *Conv.* 6-10, *Philops.* 6-10; a catalogue of the dead, *Katapl.* 4-7; or a flourish of quotations, *Pisc.* 2 f. and *Nigrinus* 7-12. Lucian uses this panel, together with the 'proclamation' element, to enclose his central speeches with a touch of literary extravagance. (Occasionally the two introductory panels are reversed: in *Timon* and *J. Trag.* the literary flourish comes first, and the scene-setting later (*Timon* 5-9, *J. Trag.* 4-5).

[40] The *Nigrinus* presents the most difficult problem of all. Bompaire's analysis (277) is not incompatible with the patterns discussed here. But there are many other problems involved, and I intend to discuss it separately elsewhere.

[41] Several scholars have been tempted to group certain works into triads, but the results are not always convincing: it is difficult to see much common ground within Hirzel's group *Prometheus*—*Dear. Iud.*—*Deor. Conc.*, except that all three are larger skits on mythology than the miniatures, but less complex than the 'Menippean' pieces. In subject-matter and tone they have little in common: *Prometheus* is a sophistic tour-de-force, *Dear. Iud.* a charming pastoral sketch, *Deor. Conc.* a conventional satire. A writer so fond of variation might be expected to produce more striking connexions than this. Bompaire cites some equally whimsical groupings (293 n. 2): but among these he includes the very obvious triad *J. Conf.*—*J. Trag.*—*Deor. Conc.*

dialogue between Alexander and Diogenes (13) he follows a different basic subject (Alexander's pretence of divinity), and in so doing develops material from the conversation with Philip (14.1) in much greater detail. In effect he has used parallel composition and transposed material in two separate operations, so that 14 is parallel to 12 but supplies the 'germ' of material for 13.

A number of the larger dialogues fall easily into similar triads. In *Icaromenippus*, *Nekyomanteia* and *Charon* Lucian is dealing with 'moral investigations on a fantastic journey': he has constructed the first two as an almost symmetrical pair,[42] and used *Charon* to develop the central episode in *Icar.*, where the follies of mankind are viewed from above. Wealth is a favourite subject in Comedy, diatribe and rhetorical tradition, and he devotes another three fantasy-dialogues to redistributing it: in both *Timon* and *Gallus* he has contrived a fantastic drama to illustrate the disadvantages of wealth and the blessings of poverty; while in *Saturnalia* there is almost no plot, and he is free to concentrate on developing the details instead. Lucian likes to masquerade as a philosopher defending himself from his critics, and he has built another triad of fantasies against his enemies: *Fugitivi* and *Piscator* are similar campaigns in which Philosophy takes part in a hunt against her false followers; and a prosecution against Lucian himself in *Piscator* appears as the climax of *Bis Accusatus* (25-35). Another triad is devoted to routine religious satire: in *Iuppiter Confutatus*, *Iuppiter Tragoedus* and *Deorum Concilium* Lucian presents Zeus embarrassed by a well-deserved challenge. Here the two small pieces are doublets of the two halves of *J. Trag.*: Momus challenges the gods in council, *Deor. Conc.*/*J. Trag.* 19-33; and a philosopher ridicules Zeus as the slave of Providence, *J. Conf.*/*J. Trag.* 34 ff.[43]

Where Lucian has used his favourite material most intensively, some of the triads naturally overlap. There are three accounts of fantastic voyages: the two books of *VH* form a parallel pair in themselves, while in *Icar.* Lucian develops a number of details from both, but in particular the trip to the moon in I. He also set out to exhaust the theme of *Katabasis*, and we should expect a triad devoted to it. *Kataplous* and *D. Mort.* 20 deal in a similar

[42] *Supra* 187.

[43] Bompaire (293 n. 2) denies this connexion, without stating his reasons. It was noted by V. Gazza (*Aevum* 27, 1953, 1-17).

fashion with the embarkation and stripping of souls; while *Neky.* amplifies the journey through Hades at *Katapl.* 22 ff. Two other groups deal with interviews with quacks, philosophic or religious. In *Vitarum Auctio, D. Mort.* 10 and *Gall.* an everyman interviews a philosopher. *Vit. Auct.* and *D. Mort.* 20 contain a number of interviews in rapid succession; *Gall.* is an extended interview with Pythagoras amplifying the satire in *Vit. Auct.* 3-6. The group *Iuppiter Confutatus, D. Mort.* 30, and *Dissertatio cum Hesiodo* are conversations with an authority on fate. In *J. Conf.* and *D. Mort.* 30 Cyniscus and Sostratus prove to Zeus and Minos respectively that man has no responsibility under it; in *Hes.* Lucian expands the arguments against Homer and Hesiod which he uses to undermine the gods in *J. Conf.*

We should also expect a Platonic 'suite'. In *Philopseudes, Navigium* and *Convivium* Lucian presents philosophers misbehaving themselves against three incongruous 'Platonic' settings: in *Philops.* and *Navig.* each philosopher contributes an unrealistic fantasy, while in *Conv.* he develops the gathering of philosophers in *Philopseudes* into a ridiculous brawl (with Ion and Cleodemus common to both).[44]

Three of the more literary of the pamphlets can also be arranged in triads, in spite of their much more specific subject-matter. In *Rhetorum Praeceptor-Somnium-de Mercede Conductis* Lucian is giving advice on the choice of a reputable career. *Rh. Pr.* and *Somnium* are parallel *syncrises*; *Merc. Cond.* develops a motif hinted at several times in *Rh. Pr.* (6-11, 26): the eager young careerist foolish enough to take a short-cut.

This pattern extends even to whole groups of dialogues: Lucian wrote three sets of 'divine conversations', *D. Deor., D. Mort.,* and *D. Mar.* The first two sets are similar in scale (twenty-six and thirty pieces), and exploit the parallel possibilities of conversations in Heaven and Hades. The *D. Mar.* serve as a shorter 'supplement' to the *affaires de cœur* in *D. Deor.*

It is clear that a high proportion of Lucian's extant work falls within these triads: when Helm (*LM* 184) tries to reconstruct an 'original' for *J. Conf., J. Trag., Deor. Conc.* and *Icar.* the attempt is bound to end in failure. Lucian is simply using the same technique

---

[44] Croiset (54) links *Philops.—Conv.—Paras.*, but the connexions are too vague. *Paras.* falls more easily into place as a humorous counterpart to *Hermotimus.*

of distributing material over several dialogues as he does anywhere else. On the other hand such groups cannot cover more than the most basic resemblances between works.[45] Nor can they have any chronological value: it would be quite unwarranted to assume that Lucian worked out a whole triad on one topic before moving on to the next, or that he wrote the pieces within a triad in any particular order. They are simply a useful way of showing us a characteristic tendency in Lucian's work: he is loth to abandon a favourite theme before he has exploited it to the full; and he often chose to do so by writing a parallel version and developing one of the details into a smaller work on its own. This does not tell us how he grouped dialogues for recitation: again we cannot assume that he designed *Toxaris, Anacharsis* and *Scytha* to be recited as a single group. It would be rash to assume that Lucian never did use them in this way; but the group only shows for certain that he worked his usual three variations on the theme 'a Scythian stranger in a Greek city'.[46]

In brief: Lucian's doublets can run to a few lines at a time—or to whole trilogies of dialogues. When he can write parallel narratives or use a fixed scheme, the commentator has to reckon with a new kind of problem: if Lucian introduces a surprise two-thirds of the way through one dialogue, what is he doing at the corresponding point of the others? The position of a motif can be as important as its content. Lucian paid *some* attention to structure, and it has been ignored for too long.

---

[45] There is an obvious doublet between *J. Conf.* and *Sat.* 1-10, but the main bulk of *Saturnalia* develops an entirely different theme, so that it has no place in the triad *Hes.—J. Conf.—D. Mort.* 30. Nor is there any obvious way of relating *D. Meretr.* to the other groups of miniatures.

[46] Of the remaining works, some are occasional pieces which could not be expected to fall easily into any kind of group: *Adv. Ind.*; *pro Lapsu*; *pro Merc. Cond.*; *Nigr.*; *Historia*; *Eun. Phalaris* I, II were presumably composed as a pair; but other pairs may well be due to the whim of survival: Lucian could have written many more *ecphrases* than *Hippias* and *de Domo*; more *meletae* than *Abdicatus* and *Tyrannicida*; and more *adoxa* than *Musc. Enc.* and *Iud. Voc.* And we might be inclined to regard *Demonax* as a wholly isolated work if Lucian had not mentioned a lost *Sostratus*, whose hero he seems to put on a par with Demonax (*Dem.* 1).

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSION

Lucian played games with the simplest of motifs, and the simplest ways of arranging them.[1] How does this affect our view of him, and how can we characterise his own contribution to his work? Scholars can still disagree about his achievements as a writer. Two articles in the same classical dictionary proclaim that his Satiric Dialogue was 'a worthy addition to Greek literature of the second rank' and that the influence of Dialogue, Comedy and Menippus 'combined to stimulate a genius unique among ancient writers'.[2] At a less sweeping level, two scholars who have greatly advanced our understanding of Lucian's literary background remain uncommitted in the end: Householder concluded his review of Bompaire's *Lucien Écrivain*:

> 'the real mystery about Lucian . . . is why (he) is not merely another Alciphron or Aelius Aristides. Bompaire's extremely thorough and valuable book does not, however, seem to give us any answer to the question, except to imply that it is due to some mystic inner greatness in Lucian.' [3]

Householder's own solution—apart from 'some special strength of character'—is to deny Lucian any credit, and suppose that he derived his independence from some completely anonymous teacher. He has already admitted, however, that '(Lucian's) real greatness lies in the skill with which he can play beautiful variations on (frequently banal) themes provided by others.' We are now in a position to put this claim to the test; and no study of Lucian's variations would be complete without it.

There is no lack of literature from the same general milieu as Lucian, but little of it is exactly comparable: there are few frivolous mythical pieces in Imperial prose apart from his own; and those that do survive are merely the *jeux d'esprit* of authors whose

[1] Schwartz (*BPhW* 16, 1896, 360) expressed the hope that this would 'mehr resultate zeitigen' than chronological patterns.

[2] *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*², 1970, *s.v.* Lucian (W. M. Edwards); Dialogue (R. H. Hackforth).

[3] *AJPh* 82 (1961), 201.

main interests were rather more elevated. But several *opuscula* by Dio, Plutarch, Philostratus and Julian the Apostate have enough in common to invite comparison.

Lucian's *Gallus* starts off in the same way as Plutarch's *Gryllus* (*Mor.* 985D ff.). Both writers have produced a moralising dialogue between a mere man and a rather sophisticated animal who has lost his human shape. Lucian's Micyllus interviews Pythagoras, now a cock; Plutarch's Odysseus interviews one of his own men, now a pig. Both Pythagoras and Odysseus have some awkward questions to answer; and the cock and the pig prefer their present lot to their human lives, and reflect on the vain desires they have lost; but they turn out to be accomplished sophists just the same. There is little to choose between the two writers on any of these points. But when the discussion moves round to the animal commonwealth, they adopt very different approaches: Lucian makes his point in a single sentence, with a series of paradoxes about animals: 'You wouldn't see a bailiff-horse or a sycophant-frog or a sophist-jackdaw or a gnat-chef or a pansy-cock among them' (27). Plutarch covers the same ground, but makes this theme the main substance of his dialogue, so that the result is little more than a didactic catalogue—exhaustive exempla of animal instincts, accomplishments and upright behaviour. It is easy to account for the difference between the two authors. This topos was a familiar one in 'adoxography',[4] and Lucian had no lack of practice in dressing up the innocent in the most sophisticated guises. His flies are courageous, have precedence over kings at table, and refrain from acts of stealth in the dark;[5] the half-goat Pan is a musician but no philosopher or sophist;[6] the ass, despite his reputation for lust, is disgusted by the Galli and their bestiality;[7] and in other contexts Charon, the humble boatman from below, knows nothing about the ways of the world;[8] or the Scythian

[4] Cf. *Heroicus* p. 285 Kayser, where the vinedresser boasts that the sycophant is a beast to be found only in the agora, but not in the ideal society of the countryside; cf. Aelian *VH* II.31 (no atheists among barbarians): Max. Tyr. VII.3 (no sycophants, grave-robbers or pirates among sick men). For the pathetic fallacy, cf. Aelian *VH* I.7 (swine are not unskilled in medicine and healing); I.11 (flies are creatures most inclined to prophecy); II.28 (cocks do not fight from the same motives as humans).

[5] *Musc. Enc.* 5, 8, 9.

[6] *Bis Acc.* 11.

[7] *Onos* 38.

[8] *Charon passim.*

Toxaris knows all about courage and friendship, nothing about law-courts or speechmaking.[9] As to the personified animals, sycophant-frogs or gnat-chefs are a speciality of Lucian's: he can compare philosophers to cocks or sophists to jackdaws, or tell stories about dancing monkeys; [10] and it is not far from there to producing any number of unlikely animals.[11] Here he has only to assemble a few of these clichés inside a single sentence. Even in such a frivolous setting, however, we find Plutarch more interested in the *spoudaion* than in the *geloion*: and he has used the same commonplace as an excuse for the kind of curiosities of natural history familiar from *de Sollertia Animalium*. He is still setting out to instruct, with only a very slight concession to humour, while Lucian has concentrated his resources in order to produce pure entertainment.

The criticism of Homer in *Gall.* 17 offers similar ground for comparison. *Homeromastigia* was also a well-established sophistic exercise,[12] and it is treated at length in a not wholly serious dialogue by Philostratus (II): in the *Heroicus* a vinedresser relays information to a Phoenician sailor straight from the ghosts of Protesilaus and other Homeric heroes; Lucian's cock, having been Euphorbus as well as Pythagoras, is able to speak about Achilles for himself. Philostratus' Protesilaus is wholly well-intentioned and trustworthy throughout, whereas Lucian's Euphorbus is ready to introduce a sly exaggeration into his account of his own prowess—only to be caught out by the humble cobbler who knows his Homer! Philostratus' Helen was well worth the war, (though Homer gave her undue prominence by omitting to mention Hiera as well); Lucian's Helen is rather unexceptional, and over-aged as well as overrated! Again this kind of joke appealed to Lucian: he will make the infant Hermes older than Iapetus; [13] or give the beardless Apollo a bearded son Asclepius. Again, Philostratus' Homer lived after the war, so that Protesilaus is more reliable than Homer

[9] *Tox.* 36, 38, 42.

[10] *Pisc.* 34, *Pseudolog.* 5, *Pisc.* 36.

[11] *VH* I.11 ff. and *passim*, cf. *Zeuxis* 4 ff.

[12] It was a standard procedure in ἀνασκευή-κατασκευή to accuse authorities (ἐκ τοῦ ψευδοῦς, Theon, Spengel II. p. 120; ἐκ τῆς τῶν φησάντων διαβολῆς, Aphthonius *ibid.* p. 28). In his *Troicus* (Or. XI) Dio of Prusa sets out to exhaust the methods of contradicting Homer; the results are naturally laborious.

[13] *D. Deor.* 7.1; *J. Trag.* 26.

himself. But Lucian goes one better: his Homer was actually a camel in Bactria at the time of the war; and of course Euphorbus is naturally well-informed about transmigrations![14] Lucian has combined three motifs here: he attacks Homer's veracity and Homeric scholarship in any form;[15] he invents new combinations of men and animals;[16] and he constantly elaborates on the 'pretended eyewitness' who turns out to have been somewhere else: Phalaris' critic in Delphi has never sailed to Sicily; the philosophers who claim to know their way in the sky have not measured the distance between Megara and Athens; a historian in Corinth writes 'eyewitness' accounts of the Parthian War; or Peregrinus' disciple 'witnesses' an event which Lucian has just made up.[17]

The *Heroicus* also has material in common with other works of Lucian. A Phoenician and a vinedresser discuss *inter alia* the forgotten tomb of Ajax in the Troad; in *Charon* Hermes shows his visitor the same site.[18] At most points of contact Lucian's version is much more amusing: the Phoenician is merely stormbound, whereas Charon has a day's leave from Hades. Lucian has once more exploited the theme of an unusual return from Hades: in *Piscator* he allows philosophers up for the day.[19] Both writers naturally indulge their command of sophistic paradox. The lowly vinedresser turns out to be a cultivated philosopher, while Charon the humble boatman turns out to be an expert parodist of Homer: he has learned from the poets below, like Menippus in *Nekyomanteia*, and he can produce a good simile, like the poor cobbler Micyllus in *Gallus*.[20] Philostratus' vinedresser knows only bartering, so that he has never seen gold; neither has Charon—since he only knows about obols: and again Lucian's Micyllus does not know whether an obol is round or square.[21] Philostratus goes to great lengths to develop the fiction that Homer was in league with Odysseus against Palamedes; for Lucian Homer wins a case against Thersites with Odysseus as his advocate—like Thucydides and Xi against Sigma in *Iud. Voc.*[22] Philostratus includes a brief dialogue

14 318 f. K.
15 *Sacr.* 8; *Philops.* 2; *VH* II.32 ff.; *VH* II.20, *Hes.* 5.
16 Cf. Bompaire 693.
17 *Phal.* II.6; *Icar.* 6; *Hist.* 29; *Peregr.* 40.
18 *Heroicus* p. 287K/*Charon* 23.
19 *Pisc.* 4, Bompaire 375.
20 284K/*Neky.* 1 cf. *Alex.* 33; *Charon* 19, cf. *Gall.* 26.
21 283K/*Charon* 11, cf. *Katapl.* 21.
22 318K/*Iud. Voc.* 9, *supra* 17.

between Odysseus and Palamedes, who is to mind his own business and leave the eclipses alone; in *D. Deor.* there is a similar professional quarrel between Heracles and Asclepius, or trouble when Zeus or Phaethon start to tamper with the Sun's course.[23] Inevitably Philostratus brings up charges of falsification over the contest of the arms; Lucian's version is more immediate: Ajax speaks on the subject in person (breaking his Homeric silence)—and turns out to be a bad-tempered misanthrope in the manner of Timon.[24]

Alexander the Great was an equally popular subject in the rhetorical schools,[25] and offered further scope for frivolous dialogue. Dio of Prusa presents him in conversation with Philip (*Or.* II) and Diogenes (*Or.* IV), as in Lucian's *D. Mort.* 14 and 13; and Julian's *Caesares* [26] culminates in a contest between Alexander and several Roman Emperors, similar to Lucian's *D. Mort.* 12, in which he has to compete against Hannibal and Scipio. Dio opens with light-hearted conversation between father and son, and Alexander is able to cite Homeric authority for the details of the royal cuisine; [27] but this setting is only the prelude to a ponderous *speculum principis*. Julian's purpose is equally serious,[28] although his dialogue is set in mid-air and Silenus acts as a *scurra* for the Emperors. All three writers are of course obliged to mention the highlights of Alexander's career and point the inevitable moral: here at least Lucian has the virtue of brevity.

But his skill with this outworn material can be seen in several of the details. Both Julian and Lucian make a joke about the murder of Clitus.[29] Julian's Silenus is simply warned that Alexander will do the same to him. But Lucian introduces the matter casually and subtly: the ghost of Philip tells Alexander that he heard all about the Thebans from his fellow-shade Clitus, whom Alexander had killed for praising his father! Lucian has introduced a characteristic topos: Clitus turns out to be an informer, like Helios,

---

[23] 309K/*D. Deor.* 13; *D. Deor.* 10, 25.

[24] 314K/*D. Mort.* 29, cf. *Timon*.

[25] Cf. Aphthonius, Spengel I. p. 40 (ψόγος Φιλίππου); Max. Tyr. *Or.* 29.2; Bompaire 163 ff.

[26] For numerous parallels with Lucian in this uninspired work, see Helm *LM* 74 f. and notes.

[27] II.3 ff., 44 ff. Cf. *de Parasito passim*.

[28] 306C.

[29] 331BC/*D. Mort.* 14.3.

Selene, Pythagoras, Pan, or even Orpheus.[30] Alexander's mortality has also to be attacked: Dio makes weak jokes about his bastard status, or about Olympias, whom Philip finds more warlike than a goddess; and his Alexander would prefer to rule a third of the dead than be only one of the gods, while Julian makes fun of Alexander for claiming conquests when mortally ill.[31] In Lucian's version Alexander admits that he is a lifeless corpse, newly dead —but he still hopes to be a god, at least to the Egyptians! Lucian has included his usual joke about the body in one place which masquerades as a god somewhere else;[32] and Egyptian gods are always a fruitful source of fun. Lastly, the outcome of Alexander's contest: in Julian, Marcus Aurelius takes precedence over him, but this is propaganda rather than humour. In Lucian however the result is a surprise: Scipio appears *ex abrupto* to disqualify Hannibal; and again the interruption by a third party turns out to be a 'Lucianic' situation.[33]

In all these examples Lucian's versions are distinguished by two characteristics. He is able to resist the temptation to be exhaustive: since he seldom works a favourite theme less than three times at least he does not have to include everything each time. By confining themselves to only a few *jeux d'esprit*, the rest of these writers try to write compendious works, and fail to carry their learning lightly. Even Lucian's monotonous *D. Mort.* or *Vit. Auct.* can claim to be less laborious than Plutarch's catalogue of animal virtues, Philostratus' meticulous descriptions of each Homeric hero in turn, Julian's check-list of Emperors, or Dio's instructions to them. And in spite of the dialogue form, their work relies very heavily on indirect reporting; much of Lucian's liveliness depends on his presenting the most unlikely people in the first person, with a πρώην, an ἄρτι or an ἤδη to make the dialogue still more immediate.

Secondly, the cross-references suggest that Lucian's cleverest witticisms are the result of considerable practice: he is able to combine sophistic paradoxes more concisely than the rest, simply because he is using them all the time. In fairness to Plutarch or Dio, the *Gryllus* or the second Βασιλικός suggest that it is partly

---

[30] *Gall.* 5; *Fugit.* 1, *Icar.* 21; *Gall.* 14, 28 ff.; *Bis Acc.* 11; *Fugit.* 29.
[31] Dio IV.18; II.17; IV.50; Julian 331B.
[32] *D. Mort.* 13.3/cf. 3.2; 16.5 (*supra* 98 f.).
[33] 335C/*D. Mort.* 12.7, cf. *supra* 90, 123.

their lack of inclination that has left Lucian alone in the field, rather than lack of literary talent. There was clearly a common fund of 'sophistic' jokes; and only Lucian has made full use of it.

Apart from comparing other humorous dialogues, the best way to see Lucian in perspective is to look at his similes. Here his debt to rhetoric is most apparent, but it is in this field that he achieves some of his most characteristic results by constant reworking.[34] Of course he repeats, expands or contracts similes just like any other material, and it is here that his methods come closest to those of other Imperial writers. But he can take command where others are enslaved. Dio of Prusa, for example, returns to the 'Cynic' simile of the doctor even more persistently than Lucian resorts to the tragic actor; [35] but while he is always able to vary the precise point of comparison, he is prepared to scatter his medical similes in the most perfunctory manner, as an ornament learned in the schools and little else. On the other hand he has no interest in piquant anecdotes about doctors; he does not attempt to combine his theme with incongruous material, or even appeal to the 'authority' of Homeric physicians. Lucian on the other hand uses medical material only occasionally—the Cynic image of the philosopher as doctor, or the Platonic one of the doctor's professional skill; [36] but as usual he prefers the bizarre: history cannot admit lies any more than the windpipe admits obstruction; or the skilled surgeon with the rusty blade is better than the foolish one with the gold-inlaid scalpel.[37] This last example is already verging on an anecdote; and in general Lucian tends to utilise the same raw material outside the scope of didactic similes, and fit his doctors and their cures into a whole range of his interests: they find 'professional' reasons for not curing their stepmothers; intervene with an emetic for verbosity; have healing effigies erected in their honour; criticise the excesses of their philosopher patients; or find a clever ruse to escape a madman! [38] And in general Lucian uses them to swell the ranks of his rogues—by dying along with their patients, finding quack cures,[39] or sacrificing to Asclepius and attending patients

[34] Bompaire 424-43, esp. 436, 438.

[35] Catalogued by J. Oesch, *Die Vergleiche bei Dio*, Diss. Zurich, 1916, 15 ff.

[36] *Katapl.* 7; *Hippias* 1.

[37] *Hist.* 7; *Adv. Ind.* 29.

[38] *Abdicatus* 27 ff.; *Lex.* 20; *Scytha.* 2, *Peregr.* 27 f.; *Gall.* 10, *Philops.* 8; *Conv.* 20.

[39] *Katapl.* 6; *Alex.* 22, 25, 53; cf. *Peregr.* 28.

after they return from the dead![40] In the same vein we find Asclepius himself always being bothered by his patients, and reminding Heracles that treating his burns was a major operation; while Chiron wisely avoids any reference to the disastrous end of his medical career![41]

In one last example we can see Lucian making the most out of the least promising material. Second century rhetors never tire of re-working the Platonic simile of the pilot and the ship of state:[42] even Maximus of Tyre was able to produce a competent *syncrisis* between a seaworthy vessel and a luxurious craft which sinks on its maiden voyage; and at *Bis Acc.* 2 Lucian's Zeus compares himself to a steersman, always alert whatever the crew may be doing. All this is entirely conventional;[43] but at *J. Trag.* 46 ff. Zeus listens to philosophers working out two versions of the same simile, without being able to intervene. The Stoic repeats a version similar to that in *Bis Acc.*; but the Epicurean twists it into a detailed burlesque—the ship has no captain and is drifting in chaos. It is not the details of this second passage which distinguishes it from other imitations of Plato: even Maximus of Tyre was able to use the routine apparatus of rhetoric on the subject. But Lucian has introduced a malicious twist into the context: Zeus is forced to see his sovereignty stand or fall on a battle of similes. And he reveals his own bad taste at the same time; no rhetor himself (cf. 15), he prematurely approves the Stoic's specious version, only to find how easily the Epicurean can outdo him. Lucian has also turned the event into another absurd mock-battle. The nautical similes develop into a naval engagement (50): Damis heads for victory under full sail, capsizing all the commonplace arguments; he has sunk Timocles' ship in the Porch, just as Lycinus capsizes Adimantus' ship between Athens and the Piraeus. As for the vessel itself, apart from the precise detail and *couleur diatribique* noticed by Bompaire, Lucian's topsy-turvy ship has something in common with the surprising craft in *VH*. And apart from the allusion to Plato's most ambitious nautical simile (*R* 488B), he has fused his version with two classic scenes from Aristo-

---

[40] *Philops.* 21, 26.

[41] *Bis Acc.* 1, *D. Mort.* 13; *D. Mort.* 26.

[42] See Bompaire 433 ff.

[43] The examples are listed by P. Louis, *Les Métaphores de Platon*, Paris 1945, 217 f.

phanes: the Epicurean's comparison is in effect the ἄδικος λόγος which defeats the arguments of its pious rival; and a god looks on during a literary contest, as in *Ran.* 833-1471. True to second-century form, the Epicurean's sophistries are now in prose. Lucian is not only satirising the gods and philosophers: he writes his most elaborate simile and makes fun of school similes at the same time; and all this in the most sophisticated literary texture. Lucian's *complexe mécanisme littéraire* has produced results.

It is easy to criticize the Second Sophistic for doing the very things which Lucian did well: for van Groningen 'they practised the art, if art it was, of varying themes'.[44] Whether Lucian's technique of variation is an art can easily be decided from the foregoing discussion. His variations are the real *Lukianisches in Lukian*, and he has succeeded as few ancient writers have done in making the techniques of the hack into an art in themselves.

But there are reservations. Is he to be hailed as an original artist even in his happiest creations, when so many of them have been explained as unusual or elaborate variations on the simplest group of motifs? Was he only lucky to 'hit on' the right combinations, among so many that are either bizarre or mediocre? He could certainly have left a better impression by exercising the skills he had with more restraint and taste, and he was never free from several weaknesses. He could scarcely claim to have produced any worthwhile production on the theme of Hades, for example, in proportion to the number of attempts he made to exhaust it. At the same time he squandered a number of ingenious combinations of material in encomia or invective where he is writing for a single occasion and trying to include too much.

These remarks equally well apply to Lucian's methods of organisation. He did have a plan, and he exploits it intensively. If it is his own, it goes further than the rhetorical formulae of his day, but it may still be no more than ingenious pastiche. Once more it saves him from monotony in some dialogues, since it enables him to arrange his material in contrasting sections; but he adheres to it—or slips back to it—too often to avoid monotony over the dialogues as a whole.

On present evidence we should draw this conclusion: Lucian developed the techniques available from rhetoric, popular classics,

---

[44] *Mnemosyne*, 4th series 18 (1965), 51.

popular philosophy and fiction to the full; with his taste for the eccentric, absurd and incongruous he was able to use them in a way which does deserve to be called individual; but in his career as a rhetorician or minor sophist he failed to control all his own techniques and talents all the time. He is a hack and virtuoso at once—often within the same dialogue.

There are still other questions about Lucian's technique to be answered: we still know next to nothing about his chronology, or what procedures he used during the composition of a work: did he write preliminary sketches, compose several pieces concurrently, write down improvisations afterwards, or try to avoid repetition between consecutive works? And what kind of permutations might he have produced from the same material in works now lost? These studies have not attempted to supply answers to such questions: they attempt to show that the answers to some others must first be sought, if not always found, within Lucian's own work. And there is much more of this evidence available: οἴκοθεν ὁ μάρτυς, φασίν.

APPENDIX I

CROSS-REFERENCES AND LUCIAN'S CHRONOLOGY

I have examined Lucian's technique of literary variation without reference to any chronological framework. There is no accepted dating for more than a handful of his works,[1] and here I wish to show why I believe that the order in which he wrote them is entirely irrelevant to the study of his motifs.

It should be clear from the preceding chapters that Lucian is making patterns with a kaleidoscope of themes. We have to admit in the end that it is futile to work out the chronology of the patterns in a kaleidoscope: there are certain kinds of literature which simply do not admit of 'evolution', and Lucian devoted himself to producing them in bulk. It is practically impossible to arrange his works in an order which would occasion any surprise. It is still more difficult to devise any order which shows successive 'waves' of imitation: it does not help matters when Lucian concentrates on synthesising a particular author or genre at a time for literary reasons (as in *Timon* or *Convivium*). And any order which could be obtained would be of little value in itself. It makes no difference to our view of Lucian's technique whether he wrote *Verae Historiae* the moment he emerged from the schools, during the Parthian War, or in his extreme old age. If it were his first work, then he has proved that his versatility with elementary motifs was there from the very beginning, since there are already numerous cases of parallelism within the one piece. If it is any later, then he has simply used it to collect together repertoire already available. Again, we know that he must have written *Icaromenippus*, *Hermotimus* and *Navigium* in *some* order—or composed them simultaneously. No arrangement in time can reveal anything like progress: he is merely applying the same technique to different

[1] The basic 'system' of Lucianic chronology is implied, with little real justification, in Helm *LM passim*. It is as likely as any other system based on intuition; and modifications by Sinko (*Eos* 14, 1908, 113-158, *Symbolae Chronologicae ad scripta Plutarchi et Luciani*, Cracow 1947) are very unequal in quality. So, it has to be said, are the ingenious calculations of Schwartz' *Biographie*: Hall (42 ff.) provides a balanced and sensible refutation. We are still thrown back on Bompaire's 'achronie' (Reardon 169 n. 8).

spheres of literary interest—and the results come out rather similar in the end: we are working with the same kind of material as Plato's Myths, Alciphron's Letters, or Aristophanes' early Comedies.

The few absolute dates [2] we know do nothing to remove these impasses. Lucian wrote *Imagines* and *pro Imaginibus* not later than 164, *Peregrinus* and *Fugitivi* not much later than 165, *Historia* not later than 166. At the other end of his career, *Eunuchus* is not earlier than 176, *Demonax* than 177, *Alexander* than 180.[3] There is enough common ground between the two groups to show that Lucian has not 'developed'. *Alexander* is little different in intention or execution from *Peregrinus*, while *Eunuchus* and *Demonax*, apparently close in time, treat eunuchs in quite different ways. Nor does a more elaborate version of any given material necessarily imply a later date: the story of Alexander's architect is told more elaborately in *pro Imag.* than in *Historia*, which must be several years later.[4] Nor is there any perceptible difference in the handling of early and late *prolaliae*: without almost accidental evidence it would be impossible to suspect that *Prometheus es* was written when Satiric Dialogue was a novelty, *Bacchus* and *Heracles* when Lucian was already old.[5]

In the midst of this chronological vacuum we are thrown back on quite different criteria. Lucian's material came from somewhere, and it is only too clear from the studies of Bompaire and Householder that most of it derives from his own school reading, which coincides, with only a few exceptions, with the standard second-century curriculum authors. One cannot suggest a 'Menippean' phase in Lucian's work followed by a 'Platonic' one, when Lucian's Plato amounts to what every schoolboy knows.[6] For the rest, he has to be aware of Old Comedy before he writes even the first Satiric Dialogue; and much of his vocabulary of Cynic motifs is reflected in his memoirs of his teacher Demonax. It follows

---

[2] The relative chronology of several other pieces is of little help: Lucian refers to his own age—or that of his mouthpiece—as around forty (*Bis Acc.* 32, *Herm.* 13); but it is pointless to attach anything to such a suspiciously round number—especially when we have no precise date of birth to relate to it.

[3] Cf. Schwartz, *Biographie o.c.* 17-20.

[4] *Pro Imag.* 9; *Hist.* 12.

[5] *Prom. es* 6 (contemporary with *Bis Acc.* 33?)/*Bacch.* 7; *Her.* 8.

[6] See Householder 64.

that he had a fully developed repertoire—of the most elementary kind—by the middle 'sixties (and probably long before). It is difficult to decide when he read such authors as Ctesias or Iambulus, to say nothing of the elusive Antonius Diogenes: but he seems to imply in the preface of *VH* that these authors, to us apparently recondite, were immediately recognisable when parodied, and so popular classics in their own right.[7]

At first sight the lack of chronology looks like a serious drawback to any study of cross-references. How useful are works which Lucian *might* have written in the 170s for explaining works which he *might* have written in the 150s (or after 180)? The risks are not very great, precisely because Lucian is manipulating such popular material. If he refers to Stesichorus' palinode in a work of the early 'sixties, we do not assume that he was re-reading lyric poets just at that time. We have to look forward to equally perfunctory references to it in later works, and relate them to a classic joke on the subject at Pl. *Phaedr.* 243A f.[8] And in most cases we have the complementary evidence of school authors to hand. In *Hist.* 29 Lucian mentions Parthians terrifying the Romans with serpents. We have to explain this as a variation on the theme 'a surprise secret weapon', by citing a parallel from *Bacch.* 1-3, which is almost certainly much later, and note that the theme is equally accessible through Herodotus, Ctesias, or the *Bacchae.*[9] The cross-reference simply emphasises that the theme *appealed* to Lucian: whichever 'model' he imitated when he first used it, he found it in several others as well.

His most elusive source is Old Comedy. Householder [10] correctly inferred that he probably did not read it at school: do we run the risk of analysing into half-a-dozen 'characteristic' motifs something which Lucian had in fact borrowed straight from a lost Comedy, then broke down as required? This is always possible, but it is only the normal risk that any *Quellenforscher* has to face. All we can say is that Lucian's use of Plato is extremely limited, and his Aristophanes equally so—so far as we can judge. The rediscovery of the *Dyskolos* shows us how sparingly he could exploit a text which Aelian could paraphrase almost word for

---

[7] *VH* I.2 f.

[8] *Pro Imag.* 15; *Apol.* 1.

[9] Cf. *supra* 37.

[10] Householder 64.

word: it does not suggest a secret store which Lucian is exploiting.[11] And it is instructive to study Lucian's use of Theophrastus' *Characters* before assuming a Comic source for the end of *Timon.* Nor can we take Lucian's quotation of Comic fragments as evidence—he quotes very little of the Aristophanes he knew, and comic tags were only too accessible by other means.

But only a limited proportion of the cross-reference I have used are concerned with themes as such. Many deal with his likes and dislikes, or his general attitudes. We do not need a chronology or an *Urquelle* when he is condemning pretentious statues, embellishing tall stories, or using the figure sixteen. Cross-references of this kind are particularly useful when Lucian is perpetrating some kind of deliberate falsehood. It does not matter when he wrote *Rhetorum Praeceptor* 17, where he gives advice on how to forge false parallels from India or Ecbatana: this helps us equally with the forged oracles in *Alexander*, or the much earlier bogus historians in *Historia.*

In some cases too the solutions depend on logic rather than chronology. Most of Lucian's 'erudite' works were written in response to a particular occasion. Even if other examples of erudition can only be salvaged from later works, he must obviously have been drawing on resources acquired earlier and ready to hand. And we can safely infer that he was interested in half-burnt figures before he saw Peregrinus on fire, and Utopias before he knew about the Christians: bookish authors correct events to their books, and not vice versa.

But the most important factor is converging sources. If Lucian used an unknown author for the first time in the mid-seventies, it is very difficult to see what that author could have contributed that would not overlap substantially with his own basic repertoire anyway. The chances of explaining Lucian from single sources are gone for good.

These considerations allow us to use undated cross-references with some degree of confidence. With the other evidence at our disposal we can adapt Perry's outspoken remark on the 'evolution' of the Greek novel: Lucian conceived the first Satiric

---

[11] *Supra* c. VI; for Aelian, see I. L. Thyresson, *Eranos* 62 (1964), 7-35. I have discussed the limitations of Lucian's reading in detail in *Lucian's Classics*, forthcoming in *BICS*.

Dialogue 'on a Tuesday afternoon in July, or some other day or month of the year' [12]. He spread the rest over the next few days—or the next thirty years.

---

[12] B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances*, California 1967, 175.

APPENDIX II

THE *PISCATOR* SCHEME: SOME TENTATIVE ORIGINS

Did Lucian invent his favourite scheme? He could scarcely have taken it from the manuals, where there is no place for a dialogue *genre* in epideictic oratory; we have to turn once more to the author and his sources.

Since most scholars[1] regard *de Domo* as an early 'sophistic' work, it might be expected to afford some clue as to how Lucian evolved his standard scheme. Piot[2] and Helm (*PW* 1739) stress the element of *syncrisis* which underlies the work: the beautiful building either encourages the speaker (1-13) or distracts him (14-31); Lucian himself takes the former part, with the argument as his opponent. But this latter section is curiously ill-assorted, and needs to be seen in terms of Lucian's practice elsewhere:

1-6a:	The subject is suitable.	*Introduction* I
6b-9:	'Description' of the Hall.	II
10-13:	It stimulates the speaker.	Argument I
14-31:	*the logos replies*:	
15-17:	The Hall distracts both the speaker	Argument II
18-19:	—and the audience.	Argument III
20:	Herodotus appears to support this argument.	
21-31:	Nine ecphrases of pictures in the Hall.	
32:	*Captatio.*	

This is certainly much nearer to Lucian's usual habits of arrangement than the subject-matter leads us to expect. The main outline is similar to the scheme of *Piscator* or *Timon*: as in the latter he has used the central section for a rhetorical tour-de-force which has very little to do with the real subject of the work. Herodotus' surprise appearance supplies the motif of trial or

[1] Cf. Schmid-Christ II^{6}.719; Schwartz suggests c. 160; Sinko (*Eos* 14, 1908, 125) remains rightly cautious. Nissen's dating (*RhM* 43, 1888, 243 f.) depends on a very tentative connection with Arrian *Anab.* II.iv.7.

[2] *Les procédés littéraires de la seconde sophistique chez Lucien: l'ecphrasis*, Thèse Rennes 1914, 59.

proclamation we have come to expect after the middle section (20). Instead of a disjointed series of pretenders in the comic 'dramas', Lucian has added a perfunctory catalogue of pictures. It would be useless to make any assumptions about *de Domo*: it looks like a haphazard attempt to include a large number of 'Lucianic' features at once. If the result is bizarre, it need not be early. Once more, however, we can turn to Lucian's three main 'classical' sources:

(a) *Old Comedy*

Among his favourite plays were Ar. *Nub.* and *Ran.*: each of these contains a departure from Aristophanes' own practice;[3] and it is these features which are reflected *mutatis mutandis* in Lucian. Once *Nub.* is stripped of its choral interludes and parabaseis, the outline is familiar:

1-125:	Introductory scene between Strepsiades and Pheidippides.	*Introduction* I
126-262:	Strepsiades at the Phrontisterion.	II
314-477:	Socrates and Strepsiades argue over the role of Zeus in the universe.	*Debate* A
949-1104:	The *Logoi* debate the education of the young.	B
1345-1451:	Strepsiades and Pheidippides debate the moral conduct of sons.	C
1452-1475:	Strepsiades condemns the impostors,	*Exposure*
1476-1511:	and burns down the Phrontisterion.	*Scene*

Not only is this scheme similar to Lucian's: it contains the three confrontation scenes which he singled out for special imitation elsewhere:[4] Lucian had the opportunity to see a framework which comprised three favourite debates, leading to a final scene

[3] Three quasi-agons in a single play. See Th. Gelzer, *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes*, *Zetemata* 23, Munich 1960, 138 f.

[4] Lucian reproduces the arguments on the sovereignty of Zeus at *J. Trag.* 35-51: for Strepsiades and Socrates he has only to substitute the simple Stoic and the crafty Epicurean. The *Logos*-debate stands out among the sources of *Rh. Pr.* (*supra* 18); and he introduces the distraught country layman, disillusioned at what the next generation is learning in the schools, as the climax of his most elaborate attack on the philosophers (*Herm.* 81). (*Icar.* 22-32 is also a direct imitation of *Nub.* 1451).

exposing philosophers: with his taste for Comic pastiche he could easily have adopted such a skeleton as his basic outline.[5]

(b) *Plato*

Lucian has inevitably to mimic the literary trappings of Platonic dialogue;[6] he might at the same time have attempted to reproduce the overall shape of Plato's pieces. Dio of Prusa may have tried to reproduce the shape of the *Phaedo*;[7] and the author of *de Parasito* was able to imitate the layout as well as the language of the *Gorgias*. Lucian's own interest in Plato is mainly confined to a few celebrated dialogues; but of these *Gorgias*, *Theaetetus* and *Phaedo* can be analysed as tripartite.[8] And just as he had a favourite Comedy, so he has a favourite dialogue: the *Phaedrus*' subject-matter is of much greater interest to Lucian than that of any other piece, and it can equally well be broken down in this way:

230E-243C:	'Lysias's' speech/237B-241D Socrates' reply.[9]	A
243E-257B:	The Myth.	B
257B-278B:	Rhetoric's shortcomings in comparison with dialectic.	C

Once more it is worth noticing that Lucian had imitated the relevant sections separately.[10]

(c) *Menippus?*

Weinreich[11] assumed that Lucian's *Icaromenippus* and Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* derive their outline from Menippus, and his analysis of the latter work does bring it close to Lucian's standard scheme:

---

[5] Sometimes Lucian writes a single debate in three phases, as in *J. Trag.* 16-32, *Prometheus*, *Deor. Conc.* Once more Aristophanes offers a precedent, this time in the literary battle at *Ran.* 1119-1250/1261-1369/1378-1413 (Gelzer *o.c.*).

[6] Bompaire 303 ff.

[7] See J. W. Cohoon's note to *Or.* XXX (*LCL* Dio II. p. 396). Philostratus confirms that this was indeed Dio's favourite reading (*VS* 488).

[8] Friedländer, *Platon*², Berlin 1954-60, II.226 ff.; III.131 f.; III.29 ff. For other tripartite divisions, see H. Thesleff, *Studies in the Style of Plato, Acta Philosophica Fennica*, Helsinki 1967, 34 ff. We are not of course concerned with how Plato himself constructed any given dialogue: it is sufficient to establish that Lucian could have read—or misread—certain dialogues in this way.

[9] Friedländer, *o.c.* III.201 f. separates the first two speeches, but Lucian could easily have read them as two halves of the same *syncrisis*.

[10] *De Domo* 4/229 ff.; for the Myth, *supra* 29; for the criticism of rhetoric, cf. *Rh. Pr.* 12 ff.

[11] Commentary, *o.c.* 57.

		Present notation:		Weinreich's notation:	
(1:	The narrator states his source	—		A	i
2:	—and repeats the date).	—			ii
3:	Conversation between Mercury and Clotho.	*Introduction*	I		iii
4:	Verse interlude: the Fates work out Claudius' and Nero's destinies.		II		
5-6:	Claudius encounters Heracles.	*Episode*	I	B i, ii	
8-11:	Council Speeches: Janus/ Diespiter/Augustus.		II		iii
12-13:	Mercury and Claudius; the lament for Claudius.		III	C	
13-15:	Claudius is denounced by his victims, tried before Aeacus, and sentenced.	*Exposure Scene*		D	
15:	Caligula appears, and the sentence is changed.			E	

After Weinreich's somewhat different labelling system has been converted to my own, it becomes clear that Seneca has indeed used the now-familiar sequence of events, including a 'proclamation' between the middle section and the trial-scene; only the narrator's prologue has no place in Lucian's arrangement. But we are not entitled to assume that both drew a common scheme from Menippus. Weinreich follows Helm in making Varro Seneca's intermediate source (he is in fact mentioned by name in c. 8); Seneca could however have taken the subject and the *prosimetrum* from Varro, but simply allowed the events to take their natural course: given the idea that Claudius tries to enter heaven first, there is bound to be a three-fold middle section when he makes his descent into Hades; and Seneca might also have gone direct to Old Comedy, as Lucian himself had done. More important, Weinreich has not fully allowed for the lacuna in c. 8: we do not know what it was that convinced Heracles and caused him to champion Claudius in the assembly; if this gap conceals a separate scene, the shape of Seneca's version might turn out rather different; and this makes it unsafe to assume that Lucian found any ready-made plan in Menippus.

(d) *A second century version?*

Lucian inherited the rhetorical habits of his age, and at first sight Dio of Prusa's first *Basilikos* (*Or.* I) bears some resemblance to his own scheme: twofold introduction (1-4: Timotheus; 4-9: Dio's role in comparison), followed by three main divisions (10-36: the true and ideal king; 37-48: Zeus as king; 49-84: the choice of Heracles). Lucian might have been adapting a simple scheme of this kind, though in Dio's case what amounts to a judgement-scene forms the third panel instead of following it, as so often in Lucian's schemes. On the other hand certain hints in Dio's version suggest that he arrived at it completely by chance. He does not attempt to connect his introduction to the scheme of kingship; his short section on Zeus is presented as little more than a *praeteritio*; and he inserts the myth of Heracles in the most offhand way, only linking it to kingship much later.[12] The whole oration has all the signs of a casual discussion; it is scarcely evidence of a 'textbook' formula to which Lucian fell heir.

It is impossible to point to a single certain model:[13] but it seems clear enough that Lucian approached the question of arrangement in the same way as he selected themes and motifs. He chose the common ground between his authors; and he succeeded in devising a scheme which can be extracted from Aristophanes, Plato, and probably Menippus as well. Here as elsewhere he has not missed an opportunity.

---

[12] *Praeteritio* 37-48; Myth 49, cf. 67 ff.

[13] Julian's *Caesares* also falls easily into three main divisions: the parade of emperors (308D ff.)/speeches by selected emperors (319D ff.)/their cross-examination by Hermes (329D ff.). But in Julian's case there is the risk that he used Lucian as well as 'Menippean' models.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(*Exclusive of items listed on p. XI*)

The nearest approach to a complete bibliography will be found in H. D. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament*, Berlin 1961 (with a heavy bias towards religious material). A shorter, wider, and more literary bibliography is provided by J. Bompaire, *Lucien écrivain*, Paris 1958, and can now be supplemented by that of B. P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.*, Paris 1971.

I. TEXTS, COMMENTARIES

The last complete text of Lucian is still that of C. Jacobitz (Leipzig 1836-41, with word-index; also Teubner 1851-72). A modern text was begun by N. Nilén (*Prolegomena* and text I-II, Teubner 1906-23); M. D. Macleod has continued the task in his completion of the Harmon-Kilburn Loeb (vol. VII, 1961; VIII, 1967) and the first two volumes of the *OCT* (1972, 1974); two further volumes are promised. For individual *opuscula* there are also K. Mras, *Dialogi Meretricii, Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen*, Teubner, Berlin 1930; Id., *Die Hauptwerke des L. griechisch und deutsch*, Munich 1954; and E. Steindl, *Scytharum Colloquia*, Teubner, Leipzig 1970. The scholia were edited by H. Rabe, Teubner 1906.

The *variorum* Commentary of Hemsterhuys-Reitz (Amsterdam 1743, Bipontine Edn. 1787-93; word-index by Reitz, 1746) is still valuable. Among modern commentaries that of H. Homeyer on Historia (*Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, Munich 1965) is invaluable; there are also serviceable works by L. Müller, (*In Luciani Philopseuden Commentarius, Eos* Suppl. 13, 1932); J. Schwartz (*Philopseudes et de Morte Peregrini*[2], Paris 1963); Th. Beaupère (*Philosophes à l'Encan*, Paris 1967); and G. Husson (*Le Navire ou les Souhaits*, Paris 1970).

II. STUDIES ON LUCIAN

Avenarius, G., Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung, Meisenheim am Glan 1956.

Babelon, E., Le faux prophète Alexandre d'Abonotichos, *Revue Numismatique* (1900), 1-30.

Baldwin, B., Lucian as a Social Satirist, *CQ* N.S. 11 (1961), 199-208.

——, The *Pseudologistes* of Lucian, *CR* N.S. 12 (1962), 2-5.

——, *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto 1973.

Bellinger, A. R., Lucian's Dramatic Technique, *YCS* I (1928), 3-40.

Benoit, F., Der Ogmios des Lukian und Herkules Psychopompos, *Carinthia* 1 (1953), 220-35 (German) = Festschrift R. Egger, Klagenfurt 1953, I. 144-158 (French).

Bernays, J., Lucian und die Kyniker, Berlin 1879.

Bluemner, H., Archäologische Studien zu Lucian, Breslau 1867.

Boldermann, P. M., Studia Lucianea, Diss. Leyden 1893.

Boll, F., Zum griechischen Roman, *Ph* 66, N.F. 20 (1907), 1-15.

Bouquiaux-Simone, O., Lucien citateur d'Homère, AC 29 (1963), 5-17.

——, Les lectures homériques de Lucien, *Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres*, LIX. 2. 1968.

Bruns, I., Lucians philosophische Satiren, *RhM* 43 (1888), 86-103, = Vorträge und Aufsätze, Munich 1905, 228-51.

——, Lukian und Önomaus, *RhM* N.F. 44 (1889), 374-396, = Vorträge und Aufsätze, 252-280.

——, Lucians Bilder, Bonner Studien, (Festschrift R. Kékulé), Berlin 1890, 51-57, = Vorträge und Aufsätze 281-290.

Capelle, W., Review of R. Helm, *Lucian und Menipp, PhW* 34 (1914), 260-76.

Casson, L., The *Isis* and her Voyage, *TAPhA* 81 (1950), 43-56.

Caster, M., Études sur *Alexandre ou le faux prophète* de Lucien, Thèse Supplémentaire, Paris 1938.

Crosby, H. L., Lucian and the Art of Medicine, *TAPhA* 54 (1923), xv-xvi.

Crusius, O., Über eine alte Tierfabel, *RhM* 49 (1894), 299-308.

——, Ein Tragikerfragment bei Lucian, *Ph* 54 (1895), 576.

Cumont, F., Alexandre d'Abonotichos. Une épisode de l'histoire du paganisme au IIme siècle de notre ère, *Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiés par l'Académie Royale des Sciences etc. de Belgique* 40, Brussels 1887.

——, L'aigle funéraire d'Hiérapolis et l'apothéose des empereurs, *RHR* 62 (1910), 119ff. = Études Syriennes, Paris 1917, 35ff.

——, Alexandre d'Abonotichos et le néo-pythagorisme, *RHR* 86, (1922), 202-210.

Delz, J., Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten, Diss. Basle, 1947, Fribourg 1950.

Fumarola, V., Conversione e satira antiromana nel Nigrino di Luciano, *La Parola del Passato*, 6 (1951), 182-207.

Funk, K., Untersuchungen über die Lucianische *Vita Demonactis, Ph* Suppl. 10 (1907), 561-674.

Gabrieli, P., L'encomio di una favorita imperiale in due opuscoli Lucianei, *Rendiconti della r. Accademia dei Lincei* (Rome 1934), 29-101.

——, Studi su due opuscoli Lucianei, 'Imagines' e 'Pro Imaginibus', *Id* (1935), 302-340.

Gallavotti, C., Luciano nella sua evoluzione artistica e spirituale, Lanciano 1932.

Gazza, V., I tre scritti affini di Luciano Ζεὺς ἐλεγχόμενος, Ζεὺς τραγῳδός, Θεῶν ἐκκλησία, *Aevum* 27 (Milan 1953), 1-17.

Hall, J., Lucian's Satire. PhD Thesis (unpublished), Cambridge 1967.

Hasenclever, L., Über Lucians Nigrinos, Diss. Munich 1907, = Progr. Munich 1908.

Heinze, R., Anacharsis, *Ph* 50 (1891), 459-68.

Helm, R., Lucian und Menipp, Leipzig 1906.

——, Art. Lukianos, *PW* XIII. 2, 1725-77.

——, Art. Menippus aus Gadara, *PW* XV. 1, 888-893.

Hense, O., Zu Lukian und Menipp, Festschrift Th. Gomperz, Vienna 1902, 185-96.

Herzig, O., Lukian als Quelle für die antike Zauberei, Diss. Tübingen 1933, Tübingen 1940.

Hornsby, H. M., The Cynicism of Peregrinus Proteus, *Hermathena* 23 (1933), 65-84.

Householder, F. W., The mock decrees in Lucian, *TAPhA* 71 (1940), 199-216.

——, Literary quotation and allusion in Lucian, Columbia, New York, 1941.

——, Lucian's use of inscriptions, *TAPhA* 74 (1943), 22.

Jacob, K. G., Characteristik Lucians von Samosata, Hamburg 1832.

Jones, C. P., Two Enemies of Lucian, *GRBS* 13 (1972), 475-87.
Kock, Th., Lucian und die Komödie, *RhM* 43 (1888), 29-59, 621-22.
Koepp, F., Ogmios. Bemerkungen zur gallischen Kunst, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 125 (1919), 38-73.
Kokolakis, M., Gladiatorial Games and Animal-baiting in Lucian, ΠΛΑΤΩΝ X (1958), 328-49.
——, Lucian and the Tragic Performances in his time, *Id.* XII (1960), 67-109.
——, The Dramatic Simile of Life, Athens 1960.
Kraemer, Dr., Die Allegorie des Prodikos und der Traum des Lukianos, *NJPP* 94 (1866), 439-43.
Ledergerber, P. I., Lukian und die altattische Komödie; Progr. Einsiedeln, 1904-5.
Legrand, Ph. E., Sur le 'Timon' de Lucien, *REA* 9 (1907), 132-54.
——, Les Dialogues des courtisanes comparés avec la comédie, *REG* 20 (1907), 176-231; 21 (1908), 39-79.
Lévy, M. I., La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences historiques et philologiques*, fasc. 250, Paris 1927.
McCarthy, B. P., Lucian and Menippus, *YCS* 4 (1934), 3-58.
Martin, J., Ogmios, *Würzburger Jahrb. f. d. Altertumswissenschaft* I (1946), 359-99.
Mesk, J., Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal, *WSt* 34 (1912), 373-382; 35 (1913), 1-33.
——, Lucians Timon, *RhM* 70 (1915), 107-44.
Mikalson, J., 'ΗΜΕΡΑ 'ΑΠΟΦΡΑΣ, *AJPh* 96 (1975), 19-27.
Moricca, U., A proposito del πλοῖον ἢ εὐχαί di Luciano, *RFC* 42 (1914), 316-333, 457-476.
Morvan, A. le, La description artistique chez Lucien, *REG* 45 (1932), 380-390.
Mras, K., Lucian und die neue Komödie, Wiener Eranos zur 50. Vers. d. Philol. u. Schulm., Vienna 1911, 77-88.
Mueller, L., De Luciani dialogorum rhetoricorum compositione, *Eos* 32 (1930), 559-86.
——, In Luciani Philopseuden Commentarius, *Eos* Suppl. 13 (1932).
Nock, A. D., Alexander of Abonuteichos, *CQ* 22 (1928), 160-62.
Pack, R., The 'volatilization' of Peregrinus Proteus, *AJPh* 67 (1946), 334-45.
Peretti, A., Luciano. Un intellettuale greco contro Roma, Florence, 1946.
Piccolomini, E., Sulla leggenda di Timone il Misantropo, *Studia di filologia greca* 1 (1882), 247-322.
Piot, H., Un personnage de Lucien, Ménippe, Rennes 1914.
——, Les procédés littéraires de la seconde sophistique chez Lucien: l'ecphrasis, Thèse Rennes, 1914.
Pippidi, D. M., Apothéoses impériales et apothéose de Pérégrinos, *Studi e materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 21 (1948), 77-103.
Praechter, K., Skeptisches bei Lukian, *Ph* 51 (1892), 284-293.
——, Zur Frage nach Lukians philosophischen Quellen, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 11 (1898), 505-16.
Putnam, E. J., Lucian the Sophist, *CPh* 4 (1909), 162-177.
Radermacher, L., Aus Lucians Lügenfreund, Festschrift Th. Gomperz, Vienna 1902, 197-207.
——, Lucian, *Philopseudes* 11, 24, *RhM* 60 (1905), 315-7.
——, Lukians Πλοῖον ἢ εὐχαί, *WSt* 33 (1911), 224-32.
——, Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage, *SAW* 206. 4, Vienna 1927.

Ranke, C. F., Pollux et Lucianus, Quedlinberg 1831.
Rein, Th., Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten bei Lukian, Diss. Tübingen, 1894.
Richard, H., Über die Lykinosdialoge des Lukian, Progr. Hamburg, 1886.
Rolleston, J. D., Lucian and Medicine, *Janus. Archives internationales pour l'histoire de la médicine* 20 (Leyden 1915), 83-103.
Schissel von Fleschenberg, O., Novellenkränze Lukians, Rhetorische Forschungen I, Halle 1912.
——, Die Technik des Bildeinsatzes, *Ph* N.F. 26 (1913), 83-114.
Schmid, Wilhelm, Bemerkungen über Lucians Leben und Schriften, *Ph* 50 (1891), 297-319.
——, Art. Anacharsis, *PW* I, 2017ff.
Schmid, Wolfgang, Menanders *Dyskolos* und die Timonlegend, *RhM* N.F. 102 (1959), 157ff.
Schmidt, O., Metapher und Gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians, Diss. Zürich, Winterthur 1897.
Schulze, P., Lukianos als Quelle für die Kenntnis der Tragödie, *NJPP* 135 (1887), 117-28.
Schwartz, J., Lucien de Samosate et certains écrits juifs, *RHPhR* 49 (1969), 135-140.
Sinko, Th., De Luciani libellorum ordine et mutua ratione, *Eos* 14 (1908), 113-58.
——, Symbolae chronologicae ad scripta Plutarchi et Luciani, Cracow 1947.
Smith, E. J., On Lucian's Nigrinus, *AJPh* 18 (1897), 339-41.
Stein, A., Zu Lukians Alexandros, Strena Buliciana. Commentationes gratulatoriae Francisco Bulic oblatae, Zagreb/Spalato 1924, 257-265.
Stengel, A., De Luciani veris historiis, Diss. Rostock, Berlin 1911.
Sybel, L., Toxaris, *H* 20 (1885), 41-55.
Tackaberry, W. H., Lucian's relation to Plato and the post-Aristotelian Philosophers, *University of Toronto Studies, philological series* 9, 1930.
Thimme, A., Quaestiones Lucianearum capita IV, Diss. Göttingen 1884.
——, Alexander von Abonoteichos. Ein Beitrag zur Glaubwürdigkeit Lukians, *Ph* 49 (1890), 507-14.
Walz, S., Die geschichtlichen Kenntnisse des Lucian, Diss. Tübingen 1921.
Weber, L., ὁ ξένος ἰατρός, *Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Instituts in Athen* 46 (1921), 76-80.
Weinreich, O., Alexandros der Lügenprophet und seine Stellung in der Religiosität des II. Jahrhunderts n. Chr., *NJklAlt* 24 (1921), 129-151.
Wirth, G., Anmerkungen zur Arriansbiographie: Appian-Arrian-Lukian, *Historia* 13 (1964), 209-45.
Zeller, E., Alexander und Peregrinus, ein Betrüger und ein Schwärmer, Vorträge und Abhandlungen II (1877), 154-88.

III. WORKS ON OTHER AUTHORS

Arnim, H. von, Leben und werke des Dion von Prusa, Berlin 1898.
Boulanger, A., Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ère, *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, fasc. 126, Paris 1923.
Durham, D. B., Parody in Achilles Tatius, *CPh* 33 (1938), 1-19.
Fuhrmann, F., Les Images de Plutarque, Paris 1966.
Hobein, H., De Maximo Tyrio quaestiones selectae, Diss. Göttingen, 1895.
Kindstrand, J. F., Homer in der Zweiten Sophistik, Uppsala 1973.
Louis, P., Les métaphores de Platon, Paris 1945.

Meiser, K., Studien zu Maximos Tyrios, *SBAW* 1909, 6.
Muenscher, K., Die Philostrate, *Ph* Suppl. X, 469-557.
Oesch, J., Die Vergleiche bei Dio Chrysostomus, Diss. Zurich 1916.
Reyhl, K., Antonios Diogenes, Untersuchungen zu den Roman-Fragmenten der 'Wunder jenseits von Thule' und zu den 'Wahren Geschichten' des Lukian, Diss. Tübingen 1969.
Rommel, H., Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Excurse bei Philostratos, Heliodoros und Achilleus Tatios, Stuttgart 1923.
Russell, D. A., Plutarch, London 1972.
Solmsen, F., Some Works of Philostratus the Elder, *TAPhA* 71, (1940), 556-72.
Weinreich, O., Senecae Apocolocyntosis, Berlin 1923.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, Der Rhetor Aristides, *SPAW* (1925), 333-53.
Ziegler, K., Paradoxographoi, *PW* XVIII. 3, 1137-66.
——, Plutarch, *PW* 21, 636-962.

IV. GENERAL WORKS

Atkins, J. W., Literary criticism in Antiquity², London 1952.
Bertram, F., Die Timonlegende, Diss. Heidelberg 1906.
Bowie, E. L., Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic, *Past and Present* 46 (1970), 1-41.
Bowersock, G. W., Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire, Oxford 1969.
Brock, M. D., Studies in Fronto and his Age, Cambridge 1911.
Clark, D. L., Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education, New York 1957.
Geffcken, J., Studien zur griechischen Satire, *NJklAlt* 37 (1911), 393-411, 469-493.
Gerth, K., 2 oder neue Sophistik, *PW* Suppl. VIII, 719-82.
Giese, A., De parasiti persona capita selecta, Diss. Kiel, Berlin 1908.
Groningen, B. A. van, Literary Tendencies in the Second Century A.D., *Mn* 18 (1965), 41-56.
Hertel, G., Die Allegorie von Reichtum und Armut, Nürnberg 1969.
Householder, F. W., Παρῳδία, *CPh* 39 (1944), 1-9.
Kroll, W., Rhetorik, *PW* Suppl. VII, 1039-1138.
Labriolle, P. de, La Réaction Païenne, Paris 1934.
Martin, J., Symposion, die Geschichte einer literarische Form, Paderborn 1931.
Meyer, E., Der Emporkömmlung, ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie, Diss. Giessen 1913.
Meyer, W., Laudes Inopiae, Diss. Göttingen 1915.
Miniconi, P. Y., Index des thèmes guerriers de la poésie épique latine, Paris 1951.
Naechster, E., De Pollucis et Phrynichi controversiis, Leipzig 1908.
Oliver, J. H., The Ruling Power: a Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43. 4 (1953), 873-1003.
Oltramare, A., Les origines de la diatribe romaine, Lausanne 1926.
Palm, J., Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit, *Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Literarum Lundensis* LVII, Lund 1959.
Reitzenstein, R., Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, Leipzig 1906.

Rohde, E., Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer[3], Leipzig 1914, repr. Hildesheim 1960.
Schmid, W., Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysios von Halikarnassos bis auf den zweiten Philostratos, Stuttgart 1887-96.
Stemplinger, E., Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur, Leipzig-Berlin 1912.
Stock, A., De prolaliarum usu rhetorico, Diss. Königsberg 1911.
Silk, E. T., The God and the Searchers for Happiness, *YCS* 19 (1966), 235-50.
Trenkner, S., The Greek Novella in the Classical Period, Cambridge 1958.
Volkmann, R., Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer[3], Munich 1901.
Waites, M. C., Some features of the allegorical debate in Greek Literature, *HSCP* 23 (1912), 1-46.

INDEX OF PASSAGES OF LUCIAN CITED

Where a general discussion of a work extends over two or more pages, individual chapters cited in the course of it are not listed separately. The tables in cc. IX and X are not included.

Abd.: 166 n. 46. *27ff.*: 173 n. 38.

Alex.: 11 n. 81, 15 n. 106, 25 n. 21, 72ff., 76f., 178, 180. *2*: 38 n. 123; *7*: 60 n. 167; *11*: 70 n. 36, 124 n. 93; *11f.*: 111; *15f.*: 16 n. 107, 96 n. 48; *17*: 78 n. 110; *22*: 173 n. 39; *25*: 124 n. 93, 126 n. 108, 173 n. 39; *27*: 124 n. 93, 125 nn. 102f.; *28*: 125 n. 106; *29*: 125 n. 104; *33*: 125 n. 107, 170 n. 33; *34*: 126 n. 109; *39*: 19 n. 137, 44 n. 31, 86 n. 8; *40*: 53 n. 113, 54 n. 118, 126 n. 111, 128 n. 125; *41*: 86 n. 13, 94 n. 30; *42*: 87 n. 18; *43*: 124 n. 93, 125 n. 105, 126 nn. 109f., 112f.; *48*: 124 n. 93; *50*: 108 nn. 50f.; *50f.*: 124 n. 93, 126; *52*: 127; *53*: 125 n. 101, 173 n. 39; *55*: 86 n. 13; *56*: 80 n. 118; *57*: 17 n. 124, 36 n. 105; *58*: 60 n. 170; *59*: 96 n. 49, 124 n. 93; *60*: 63 n. 193.

Anach.: 24, 82 and n. 136, 154f., 157, 159. *1ff.*: 19 n. 140, 129 n. 138; *9*: 50, 92 n. 17; *19*: 91 n. 12, 117 n. 36; *20*: 121 n. 71; *20-30*: 114; *21*: 114; *22*: 115; *23*: 19 n. 141, 44 n. 30; *31f.*: 116 n. 19, 162 n. 65; *31ff.*: 37 nn. 113, 117, 60 n. 168, 62 n. 179; *32*: 129 n. 131; *33*: 45 n. 39, 157; *35*: 24 n. 8, 115, 121 n. 35; *36*: 116 n. 19; *37-40*: 115.

Apol.: 133f. *1*: 93 n. 20, 129 n. 131, 166 n. 46, 179 n. 8; *5*: 19 n. 138, 80 n. 119; *6f.*: 64; *11*: 71 n. 37, 124; *13*: 15 n. 99.

(*Astr.*): *19*: 100 n. 90.

Bacch.: 178. *1*: 91 n. 7, 100 n. 85; 101 n. 100. *1ff.*: 37 nn. 113, 117, 76 n. 95, 179; *3*: 61 n. 176; *4*: 46 n. 48, 60 n. 168, 91 n. 12; *5*: 89 n. 40; *6ff.*: 25 n. 21; *7*: 61 n. 176, 178 n. 5; *11*: 70 n. 33.

Bis Acc.: 15 n. 104, 101 n. 96, 153, 162 n. 37, 174 n. 41. *1*: 25 n. 21, 124 n. 96; *1ff.*: 37, 100 n. 88; *2*: 13, 42 n. 7, 87 n. 20, 174; *2f.*: 14 n. 96; *5-11*: 163 n. 39; *8ff.*: 106 n. 25, 121 n. 71; *9*: 12 n. 85; *9ff.*: 101 n. 100; *11*: 11 n. 79, 56 n. 134, 57 n. 146, 63 n. 189, 94 n. 29, 122 n. 73, 168 n. 6, 172 n. 30; *12*: 16 n. 113, 93 n. 23, 122 n. 74; *13*: 11 n. 81, 12 n. 86, 123 n. 83; *13ff.*: 151 n. 5; *21f.*: 11 n. 79; *24*: 9 n. 64; *26ff.*: 3 n. 13; *27*: 14 n. 92; *31*: 67 n. 6, 122 n. 76; *32*: 81 n. 131, 178 n. 2; *33*: 29 n. 59, 101 n. 93, 102, 117 n. 29, 159, 162 n. 33, 178 n. 5; *34*: 32 n. 80.

Calumnia: *5*: 33 n. 84, 119 n. 46.

Charon: 12, 14, 23, 33, 82, 110 n. 61, 114, 138, 164, 168 n. 8. *1*: 92 n. 18, 100 n. 79; *1-7*: 56; *2*: 110 n. 60, 122 n. 79; *3*: 39 n. 127; *3ff.*: 137 n. 20; *4*: 119; *4f.*: 78 n. 104; *4ff.*: 19 n. 143, 105 n. 17, 110 n. 62; *5*: 137 n. 21; *6*: 122 n. 79; *7*: 29 n. 61, 92 n. 16; *7ff.*: 17 n. 116, 81 n. 127, 82 n. 133, 108 n. 41; *8*: 123 n. 86; *9-19*: 138 nn. 24ff.; *10*: 58 n. 152; *10ff.*: 98 n. 61; *11*: 124 n. 96; *12*: 116 n. 19; *13*: 123 n. 86, 17 n. 116, 58; *14*: 58 n. 153, 82 n. 133; *15*: 24 n. 4, 123 n. 83; *15f.*: 12 n. 88; *16*: 27 n. 36, 48; *17*: 20 n. 150; *19*: 14 n. 93, 24 n. 7, 82 n. 133, 170 n. 20; *20*: 105; *21*: 89 n. 40; *22*: 82 n. 133; *23*: 170 n. 18; *24*: 15 n. 101, 52 n. 96.

Conv.: 11 n. 81, 71 n. 41, 80, 87 n. 24, 88, 146ff., 162 n. 37, 165 and n. 44, 177. *1ff.*: 62 n. 183, 95 n. 37, 155 n. 17; *3*: 79 n. 112; *3f.*: 64; *6ff.*: 163 n. 39; *7*: 68 n. 15; *11*: 17 n. 117, 97 n. 53; *12*: 129 n. 138, 151; *15*: 88 n. 28; *16*: 74 n. 75; *19*: 97 n. 53; *20*: 48, 173 n. 38; *23*: 11 n. 79, 68 n. 13; *26*: 74 n. 78, 88 n. 28; *34*: 87 n. 24; *39*: 49 n. 70; *39ff.*: 105 n. 19, 151; *41*: 48; *43ff.*: 58 n. 155, 62 n. 179, 88 n. 33; *44*: 59 n. 156; *46*: 20 n. 151, 49 n. 73, 64, 106 n. 25.

Dem.: 64ff., 166 n. 46, 178. *7*: 33 n. 83; *12*: 11 n. 81, 63 n. 192; *13*: 63 n. 189; *23*: 52 n. 95; *28*: 123 n. 87.

Deor. Conc.: 11 n. 81, 12 n. 86, 19 n. 143, 20 n. 147, 129, 159 n. 29, 163 n. 41, 164f., 184 n. 5. *6*: 11 n. 76; *8*: 53 n. 104; *9*: 16 n. 108; *11*: 21 n. 152.

D. Deor.: 158 n. 27, 165. *4*: 95 n. 38, 101 n. 97; *4.2*: 93 n. 25; *4.3*: 124 n. 81; *5.2*: 51 n. 85; *6.2*: 51 n. 85; *6.4*: 87 n. 20; *7*: 119 n. 47; *7.1*: 169 n. 13; *7.3f.*: 81 n. 124; *8*: 100; *9*: 102 n. 101; *9.2*: 55 n. 132; *10*: 171 n. 23; *10.2*: 99 n. 77; *12*: 100 n. 87; *13*: 55 n. 132, 98 n. 62, 99 n. 71, 126 n. 11; *13.1*: 75 n. 79, 87 n. 24; *14.3*: 94 n. 28; *15*: 28 n. 49; *16.1*: 93 n. 20, 101 n. 98; *17*: 28 n. 49, 50 n. 80, 64, 106 n. 30; *17.1*: 17 n. 114; *17.2*: 51 n. 88, 63 n. 198, 119 n. 45; *18*: 102 n. 101; *19*: 36 n. 109; *20* (*Dear. Iud.*): 14 n. 90, 93 n. 16, 101 and n. 98, 141, 158 n. 27, 162 n. 36, 163 n. 41; *20.4*: 99 n. 71; *20.9f.*: 119 n. 45; *20.16*: 129 n. 134; *21.1*: 33 n. 82, 120 n. 53; *21.2*: 99 n. 77; *22*: 101 n. 100; *22.3*: 122 n. 74; *23.1*: 95 n. 41, 102 n. 101; *23.2*: 95; *24*: 100; *24.2*: 50 n. 84; *25*: 11 n. 81, 100, 171 n. 23; *26*: 39 n. 130, 99 n. 67; *29.2*: 101 n. 91.

D. Mar.: 165. *1*: 97f.; *1.4*: 44 n. 26; *1.5*: 16 n. 107; *4*: 36 n. 109, 51 n. 92, 71 n. 39; *6*: 101; *7*: 139 n. 33; *7.2*: 21; *9.1*: 101 n. 91; *10*: 139 n. 33; *11*: 75 n. 79, 126 n. 111; *15*: 13; *15.1*: 40 n. 132; *15.2*: 100 n. 85; *15.3*: 119 n. 45.

D. Meretr.: 6 n. 46, 50 and n. 79, 94-98, 122, 127, 166 n. 45. *2*: 139 n. 34; *4.2f.*: 34 n. 92; *4.4f.*: 55 n. 131; *7.2*: 91 n. 12; *8.1f.*: 82; *9.2*: 78 n. 107; *9.5*: 37 n. 113; *10*: 64; *10.2*: 34 n. 91; *11*: 87 n. 20; *11.3*: 122 n. 77; *12*: 139 n. 34; *13*: 37f.; *13.2*: 11 n. 78; *13.4*: 78 n. 107; *14.4*: 44 n. 26; *15*: 88 n. 33; *15.1*: 58 n. 155.

D. Mort.: 7, 11 and n. 81, 125 n. 106, 134, 165, 172. *1*: 65 n. 204; *1.1*: 49 n. 71, 50 n. 84; *2.1*: 57 n. 143; *3*: 125 n. 105, 139 n. 35; *3.1*: 125 n. 104; *3.2*: 99 n. 66, 172 n. 32; *4*: 101 n. 92, 139 n. 35; *4.1*: 39 n. 127; *5-9*: 74 n. 73, 87 n. 22, 139 n. 35; *6*: 139 n. 35; *6.2*: 9 n. 64; *7*: 87 n. 21, 139 n. 35; *9.3*: 87 n. 23, 139 n. 35; *9.4*: 87 n. 21; *10*: 11 n. 81, 67 n. 5, 165; *10.4*: 11 n. 75; *10.5ff.*: 151 n. 5; *10.9*: 9 n. 64; *12*: 98 and n. 12, 101 n. 98, 139 n. 35; *12.2*: 38; *12.7*: 172 n. 33; *12ff.*: 163f., 171f.; *13*: 174 n. 41; *13.3*: 172 n. 32; *13.6*: 115 n. 18; *14.1*: 164; *14.3*: 88 n. 33, 139 n. 35, 171 n. 29; *15.2*: 99 n. 73, 139 n. 35; *16*: 126 n. 110, 139 n. 35; *16.5*: 172 n. 32; *17*: 98; *19*: 99 n. 76, 139 n. 35; *20*: 164f.; *20.3*: 11 n. 81, 15 n. 97, 74 n. 74; *20.3f.*: 26 n. 31; *20.4*: 15 n. 97, 93 n. 27; *20.6*: 100 n. 79; *21*: 100; *22*: 139 n. 35; *26*: 99, 120 n. 57, 174 n. 41; *27*: 11 n. 81, 37, 60 n. 164; *27.2*: 57 n. 144, 58; *27.3*: 38, 58; *28*: 95 n. 36, 95 n. 39; *28.3*: 99 n. 69; *29*: 99 n. 75; *29.2*: 99 n. 77; 139 n. 35, 171 n. 24; *30*: 17 n. 120; *30.3*: 91 n. 6, 139 n. 30, 165, 166 n. 45.

Dips.: 60 n. 167, 76 n. 94. *3*: 128; *6*: 35; *9*: 128.

Dom.: 166 n. 46, 182f. *4*: 106 n. 21, 184 n. 10; *7*: 20 n. 144, 122 n. 76, 122 n. 77; *7ff.*: 118; *11*: 118 n. 44; *22ff.*: 118.

Electr.: *1*: 101 n. 90, 11 n. 81; *6*: 122 n. 80.

Eun.: 11 n. 81, 62ff., 98 n. 62, 161 n. 31, 166 n. 46, 178. *2*: 124 n. 92; *8f.*: 115 n. 11; *9*: 57 n. 146; *10*: 28 n. 50, 79 n. 111, 98 n. 64, 123 n. 90, 124 n. 91.

Fugit.: 71f., 75 n. 79, 93 n. 27, 101 n. 96, 153 n. 11, 162 n. 36, 164, 178. *1*: 11 n. 81, 17 n. 114, 91 n. 7, 172 n. 30; *1f.*: 19 n. 143; *3*: 89 n. 40; *6-11*: 163 n. 39; *12-17*: 77; *13*: 11 n. 79; *18f.*: 11 n. 77; *22*: 91 n. 8; *24-33*: 107 n. 32; *26*: 78 n. 110; *26-33*: 108; *27ff.*: 105 n. 15, 126 n. 115, 129 n. 135; *28*: 109 n. 53; *29*: 12 n. 85, 42 n. 8, 93 n. 23, 108 n. 49; 172 n. 30; *30*: 29 n. 57, 70 n. 34, 108 n. 50, 109 n. 51; *30ff.*: 72 n. 41, 96 n. 47; *31*: 2 n. 5, 109 nn. 52, 56; *32*: 2 n. 5, 30, 70 n. 35, 109 n. 55; *33*: 10 n. 72, 51, 70, 109 n. 54, 128 n. 126.

Gallus (*Somnium*): 11 n. 81, 15 nn. 97, 106, 30f., 144ff., 148, 152 n. 7, 154, 164f., 168. *1*: 16 n. 109; *1ff.*: 88; *1-7*: 156; *4*: 74 n. 74; *5*: 172 n. 30; *6*: 25 n. 21; *7*: 110 n. 61, 163 n. 38; *10*: 81 n. 129, 86 n. 8, 173 n. 38; *10f.*: 88 n. 27, 146 n. 63; *11*: 11 n. 79, 49 n. 70, 60 n. 165, 68 n. 13, 70 n. 33, 81; *12*: 16 n. 109, 87 n. 22, 107 n. 39; *14*: 49 n. 73, 54 n. 124, 70 n. 36, 86 n. 9, 87 n. 22, 88 n. 31, 92 n. 15, 109 n. 53, 115 n. 13, 137 n. 22, 172 n. 20; *15-20*: 162 n. 64; *16-20*: 126 n. 109; *17*: 15 n. 102, 169; *18*: 26 n. 31, 126 n. 113; *19*: 36 n. 108, 95 nn. 36, 39; *20*: 110 n. 60; *21ff.*: 15 n. 98; *23*: 11 n. 74, 14; *24*: 42 n. 11, 46, 86 n. 8, 87 n. 18, 115 nn. 13, 17; *24f.*: 78 n. 127, 88 n. 36, 122 n. 78; *25*: 19 n. 134, 20 n. 144, 58 and n. 150; *26*: 14 n. 93, 44 n. 25, 170 n. 20; *27*: 168; *28*: 11 n. 78, 55 n. 125, 108 n. 41; *28ff.*: 106 n. 25, 110 n. 62, 172 n. 20; *29*: 87 n. 20; *32*: 17 n. 114, 50 n. 80, 96 n. 49, 108 n. 50; 126 n. 115; *33*: 67 n. 4, 84 n. 146.

Harm.: *3*: 44 n. 24, 46 n. 45, 122 n. 75.

Herm.: 165 n. 44, 121, 134, 177. *1*: 103 n. 2; *3*: 33 n. 82; *5*: 16 n. 113, 89 n. 40; *7*: 75 n. 79; *9*: 79 n. 112; *11*: 17 n. 113; *11f.*: 11 n. 81, 58 n. 155; *12*: 59 n. 156; *13*: 81 n. 128, 178 n. 2; *16*: 68 n. 15; *22*: 121 n. 60; *24*: 11 n. 81, 81; *27*: 121 n. 61; *30*: 121 n. 64; *31*: 121 n. 62; *33*: 121 n. 65; *34*: 41 n. 4, 94 n. 34; *37ff.*: 20 n. 145; *39*: 49 n. 73; *39ff.*: 56 n. 135; *48ff.*: 68 n. 16; *59f.*: 121 n. 69; *60*: 35 n. 101; *60f.*: 35 n. 99; *64*: 91 n. 12; *65*: 121 n. 68; *71*: 11 n. 81, 21 n. 25, 42 n. 7, 84 n. 144, 121 n. 66; *73*: 121 n. 63; *74*: 2 n. 3, 109 n. 56, 121 nn. 67, 70; *81*: 11 n. 79, 20 n. 151, 49, 70 n. 33, 115 n. 11, 183 n. 4; *82*: 51 n. 93; *86*: 115 n. 18.

Historia: 10 n. 70, 12, 15 n. 105, 59-62, 116ff., 166 n. 46, 178, 180. *1*: 46 n. 45, 48 n. 67, 115 n. 12; *1f.*: 88 n. 37; *7*: 37 n. 173; *9*: 42 n. 15; *10*: 33 n. 85, 42 n. 10, 95 n. 41; *12*: 12 n. 83, 47 and nn. 58ff., 178 n. 4; *13*: 77; *14*: 77, 78 n. 108; *14ff.*: 37 n. 115; *14-32*: 77-80; *15*: 77 n. 98, 78 and n. 106, 79; *16*: 77, 79; *17*: 77f.; *20*: 38 n. 121, 88 n. 29; *22*: 44 n. 30, 77, 79; *23*: 81 n. 124; *24*: 78 nn. 103f., 121 n. 61; *26*: 77; *28f.*: 80; *29*: 11 n. 81, 38 n. 121, 46 n. 48, 55, 77, 78 n. 105, 121 n. 61, 128 n. 127, 170 n. 17, 179; *31*: 77 n. 98, 79; *32*: 78; *34*: 34ff., 124 n. 92; *35*: 45 n. 36; *38*: 131 n. 149; *39*: 79 n. 114; *40*: 47f.; *56*: 88 n. 29; *62*: 46 n. 49.

adv. Ind.: 166 n. 46. *4*: 45; *6*: 44 n. 27; *7*: 18 n. 128, 42 n. 10; *8ff.*: 19 n. 134, 43 n. 23, 48 n. 67; *9*: 46 n. 47; *11f.*: 48 n. 67; *19*: 47 and n. 57, 102 n. 102, 123 n. 89; *20*: 12; *21*: 42 n. 13; *23*: 54 n. 122; *25*: 17 n. 113, 74 n. 76; *29*: 43 n. 19, 173 n. 37; *29f.*: 43.

J. Conf.: 11 n. 81, 153 n. 11, 163 n. 41, 164f., 166 n. 45. *1*: 131 n. 151; *4*: 33 n. 82, 120 n. 53; *8*: 33 n. 82, 120 n. 53; *11*: 77 n. 97; *12*: 20 n. 145; *12-19*: 77 n. 97; *16*: 57 n. 143, 91 n. 9; *16f.*: 92 n. 15.

J. Trag.: 11 n. 81, 19, 163 n. 41, 164f. *1*: 61, 124 n. 98; *1-3*: 103 n. 7; *4f.*: 163 n. 39; *6*: 124 n. 98; *6f.*: 105 n. 16; *7-12*: 98 n. 62; *7-32*: 148 n. 68; *8ff.*: 19 n. 143, 20 n. 147, 120; *11*: 98 n. 64; *12*: 55 n. 128; *13*: 87 n. 24, 120 n. 54; *14*: 33 n. 82; *14f.*: 105 n. 16; *15*: 14 n. 92, 34 n. 91, 39, 105 n. 16, 124 n. 98, 174; *15f.*: 11 n. 81; *15-18*: 162 n. 36; *16*: 56 n. 134, 57 n. 146; *16-32*: 184 n. 5; *17*: 63; *24f.*: 91 n. 8; *24-32*: 83 n. 142; *25*: 20 n. 145; *26*: 169 n. 13; *30*: 11 n. 81; *30f.*: 25 n. 21; *31*: 124, 125 n. 102; *33*: 105 n. 16, 110; 124 n. 98; *34-53*: 16 n. 113, 98 n. 61; *35-51*: 183 n. 4; *41*: 19 nn. 135, 143; *42*: 11 n. 81, 55 n. 128; *43*: 124 n. 96; *45*: 11 n. 76, 32 n. 79; *46*: 40 n. 131; *46ff.*: 129 n. 138, 174; *47ff.*: 39 n. 126; *48*: 92 n. 15; *49*: 40 n. 131; *50*: 174; *51ff.*: 115.

Icar.: 6, 10 n. 71, 11 n. 81, 12, 23, 55 n. 129, 67 n. 5, 79 n. 112, 138ff., 149, 163 n. 38, 164f., 177, 184. *1*: 20 n. 148, 24 n. 14, 78 n. 103, 103 n. 6; *1-3*: 95 n. 37; *3*: 31 n. 71, 32 n. 79; *3ff.*: 11 n. 78; *4*: 33 n. 84; *4-9*: 163 n. 39; *6*: 128 n. 127; 170 n. 17; *6f.*: 121 n. 62; *6ff.*: 31 n. 69, 120; *7*: 27 n. 35; *9*: 20 nn. 146, 149, 129 n. 133; *10*: 30, 53 n. 103, 91 n. 10; *10-15*: 11 n. 77, 28ff.; *11ff.*: 31 n. 68; *12*: 92 n. 16, 146 n. 61; *13*: 29 n. 60, 31 n. 70, 42 n. 8, 55 nn. 125, 132, 68 n. 18, 75 nn. 79, 84, 92 n. 18, 93 n. 25, 99 n. 71, 126 n. 111; *13f.*: 15 n. 97, 34 n. 95, 110; *13ff.*: 17 n. 115, 81 n. 127, 122 n. 79; *14*: 24 n. 10, 54 n. 119, 71 n. 41, 128; *15*: 38, 45 n. 36, 50 n. 80, 57ff., 88 n. 33, 96 n. 47; *15ff.*: 106 n. 28, 162 n. 64; *16*: 20 n. 145, 31 n. 68f., 49 n. 73, 146 n. 16; *17*: 12 n. 88, 24 nn. 6f.; *18*: 31 nn. 68f., 71 n. 38, 91; *19*: 24 n. 5, 25 n. 20, 123 n. 83; *20*: 17 n. 114, 31 n. 69, 50 n. 84, 131 n. 155; *21*: 55 n. 126, 140, 172 n. 30; *22*: 14 n. 95, 24 n. 14, 53 nn. 104, 106, 111 n. 67; *22f.*: 111f.; *22-32*: 184 n. 4; *23*: 20 n. 145, 68 n. 19, 91 n. 7; *23f.*: 11 n. 81; *24*: 92 n. 17; *25*: 64 n. 202, 76 n. 95, 131 n. 151; *25f.*: 19 n. 143; *26*: 40 n. 132; *27*: 12 n. 84, 20 n. 147, 51 n. 86, 100 n. 85, 101 n. 100; *28*: 18 n. 126, 20 n. 144; *29*: 10 n. 71, 75 n. 89, 115 n. 12, 122 n. 77; *29ff.*: 77 n. 102; *32*: 29 n. 54; *33*: 55 n. 128, 63 n. 198, 91 n. 8; *34*: 158 n. 26.

Iud. Voc.: 11 n. 81, 98 n. 62, 129, 166 n. 46. *4*: 129 n. 133; *5*: 120, 129 n. 133; *6*: 93 n. 24, 129 n. 134; *7*: 107 n. 32, 129 n. 135; *8*: 17 n. 122, 78 n. 104; *9*: 129 n. 136; *11*: 129 n. 137; *12*: 25 n. 18.

Imag.: 44, 119, 121 n. 63, 178. *1*: 94 n. 28, 111 n. 63; *1ff.*: 119; *4*: 50 n. 78, 111 n. 64; *4-7*: 44; *5*: 120; *6ff.*: 111 n. 65; *11*: 18 n. 127, 118 n. 43, 122 n. 76; *16*: 121 n. 71; *21*: 14.

pro Imag.: 12, 178. *4*: 44; *5*: 42 n. 13, 45 n. 35, 96 n. 49, 123 n. 90; *9*: 12 n. 83, 41 n. 4, 178 n. 4; *11*: 19, 42 n. 14, 56 n. 135, 115 n. 17; *12*: 122 n. 79; *14*: 44, 46 n. 53; *15*: 11 n. 78, 179 n. 8; *23*: 19 n. 135, 71 n. 37, 81 n. 123.

Katapl.: 7 n. 51, 11 n. 81, 150f., 156, 164. *1f.*: 99 n. 68; *3*: 93 n. 21, 156; *4*: 51 n. 87, 126 n. 112; *4-7*: 163 n. 39; *6*: 11 n. 81, 173 n. 39; *6ff.*: 146 n. 61; *7*: 173 n. 36; *8*: 67 n. 9; *8-13*: 58 n. 154; *11*: 46 n. 54, 88 n. 33, 126; *12*: 17 n. 114, 126 n. 115; *13*: 9 n. 64, 11 n. 75, 99 n. 74; *14*: 67 n. 9, 115 n. 13; *15*: 67 n. 4, 99 n. 74, 100 n. 80; *16*: 60 n. 165; *18*: 36 n. 106; *20*: 105 n. 18, 106 n. 21; *21*: (38), 146 n. 61; *22ff.*: 165; *23ff.*: 63 n. 197, 106 n. 27; *25ff.*: 107 n. 31; *26*: 86 n. 8; *26ff.*: 9 n. 64; *27f.*: 25 n. 16.

pro Lapsu: 11, 130ff., 141 n. 48, 166 n. 46. *1*: 89; *3*: 58 n. 152; *4*: 120 n. 59; *7*: 113 n. 3.

Lex.: 69f., 71 n. 41, 161 and n. 32. *1-16*: 103 n. 3; *2-15*: 129; *3*: 71 n. 40; *4*: 79 n. 112, 129 n. 138; *5*: 129 n. 138; *6*: 30 n. 64, 130 n. 141; *9*: 129 n. 138; *10*: 130 n. 139; *12*: 130 n. 140; *15*: 129 n. 138; *19*: 130 n. 142; *20*: 173 n. 38; *20f.*: 30, 107 n. 33; *22*: 71 n. 40, 122 n. 78.

Lucius sive Asinus (*Onos*): 38, 130 n. 139, 168 n. 7.

Luct.: *13*: 105 n. 18; *16ff.*: 105 n. 18.

Merc. Cond.: 11, 18, 85-89, 133, 161, 165. *1*: 40; *1f.*: 129 n. 138; *3*: 30; *5*: 30 n. 63; *11*: 11 n. 82, 127, 130 n. 145; *13*: 123; *17*: 122 n. 72; *23*: 11 n. 82, 102 n. 104; *24*: 11 n. 82, 102 n. 104; *28*: 122 n. 81; *29*: 57 n. 146; *33*: 29 n. 58, 53 n. 103; *34*: 16 n. 107; *35*: 45 n. 37; *36*: 50; *39*: 74 n. 78; *41*: 18 n. 125; *42*: 33 n. 84, 67 n. 42, 68 n. 17, 119 n. 46, 161 n. 30.

Navig.: 10 n. 70, 11 n. 81, 155-159, 165, 177. *4*: 11 n. 78; *5-9*: 39, 163 n. 39; *6*: 40 n. 131; *8*: 39 n. 129; *9*: 40 n. 131; *11*: 11 n. 78, 16 n. 110; *11f.*: 25 n. 21; *14*: 78 n. 105; *20*: 107 n. 39; *22*: 86 n. 16, 87 n. 18; *24*: 11 n. 81, 71 n. 38; *28*: 38; *28ff.*: 37 n. 112, 137 n. 20; *28-38*: 76, 162 n. 65; *30*: 137 n. 21; *33ff.*: 97; *33-38*: 37f.; *34*: 123 n. 86; *35*: 78 n. 104, 121 n. 61; *36*: 38 n. 118; *38*: 137 n. 23; *42*: 30f., 137 n. 18; *42ff.*: 121 n. 66; *44*: 13, 31 n. 69, 42 n. 7; *45*: 53 n. 111; *46*: 31 n. 71.

Neky.: 12, 23, 67 n. 5, 109 n. 58, 110 nn. 60ff., 139 n. 37-140 n. 44, 149 n. 72, 151 n. 8. *1*: 7 n. 51, 10 n. 73, 11 n. 78, 19 n. 139, 29 n. 56, 33 n. 85, 61 n. 176, 104, 125 n. 107, 164f., 170 n. 20; *2*: 11 n. 78; *3ff.*: 163 n. 39; *7ff.*: 51 n. 91, 55 n. 131; *8*: 128 n. 126; *10*: 111 n. 67; *13*: 17 n. 119, 91 n. 6; *14*: 152 n. 7; *15*: 36 n. 106; *16*: 12 n. 88, 20 n. 144, 25 n. 20, 42 n. 11, 115 n. 12; *17*: 125 n. 107; *19*: 11 n. 78, 148 n. 69, 163 n. 38; *20*: 60 n. 165, 78 n. 110, 152 n. 7.

Nigr.: 11 n. 81, 81, 83, 85-89, 163 n. 40, 166 n. 46. *1*: 61 n. 175; 111 n. 63; *1-12*: 95 n. 37, 104; *2*: 81 n. 125, 129 n. 138; *4*: 17 n. 118, 55 n. 130, 81 n. 125; *6ff.*: 11 n. 78, 111 n. 64; *7*: 33 n. 83, 104 n. 13, 121 n. 71; *7-12*: 163 n. 39; *8*: 115 n. 15; *8ff.*: 104; *9ff.*: 104 n. 13; *10*: 115 n. 15; 117 n. 36; *11*: 68 n. 20; *12ff.*: 111 n. 65, 115 n. 15; *13*: 45 n. 39; *14*: 42 n. 14, 45 n. 39; *17-20*: 17 n. 118; *35*: 114 n. 5; *35ff.*: 7 n. 49; *38*: 61 n. 175.

Paras.: 165 n. 44; 171 n. 27; 184.

Phalaris: 8, 75 n. 79, 166 n. 46. *I. 11f.*: 60 n. 164; *II. 6*: 170 n. 17.

Peregr.: 11 n. 81, 60 n. 164, 72-76, 115 n. 13, 160, 178. *3ff.*: 52 n. 98, 60 n. 163; *3-31*: 56; *4*: 54 n. 122; *7*: 63 n. 196, 161; *11*: 109 n. 52; *11ff.*: 26; *12*: 50 n. 81; *13*: 26 nn. 26, 29; *14*: 17 n. 123, 91 n. 6; *16*: 26 n. 31; *17*: 109 n. 52; *18*: 52 n. 100; *25*: 99 n. 71; *27*: 53 n. 105; *27f.*: 173 n. 38; *28*: 173 n. 39; *29*: 55 n. 127; 105 n. 20, 125 nn. 99, 103; *31*: 79 n. 111; *32ff.*: 60 n. 162, 78 n. 106; *33*: 54, 55 n. 128, 63 n. 195, 100 n. 81; *35*: 55 n. 128; *36-39*: 52-56; *39*: 54 n. 116, 128 n. 125; *39f.*: 55 n. 129; *40*: 128 n. 127, 170 n. 17; *41*: 15 n. 99, 54, 88 n. 36; *43*: 100 n. 81; *45*: 55 n. 130.

Philops.: 30, 34 n. 95, 49, 52, 79 n. 112, 80, 121, 146, 156f., 162, 165 and n. 44. *1ff.*: 113; *1-10*: 155 n. 17; *2*: 114 n. 10; *3*: 170 n. 15; *5*: 11 n. 78, 42 n. 12, 57 n. 146, 59 n. 158, 62 n. 183; *6-10*: 163 n. 39; *7*: 127 n. 118; *7f.*: 127f.; *7-38*: 158 n. 26; *8*: 93 n. 20; 173 n. 38; *11f.*: 60 n. 167, 76 n. 94, 128; *13*: 51, 93 n. 20; *14*: 55 n. 131, 81 n. 123; *15*: 64 n. 201; *16*: 16 n. 113, 48 n. 68; *18*: 34 n. 93, 119, 130 n. 140; *19f.*: 75 n. 79; *19ff.*: 115 n. 17; *21*: 174 n. 40; *22-24*: 7 n. 51; *23*: 32 n. 79; *24*: 126 n. 108, 128 n. 127; *26*: 174 n. 40; *27*: 122 n. 72, 126 n. 116; *29*: 68 n. 15; *31*: 48 n. 68; *35f.*: 105 n. 17; *38*: 11 n. 78, 25 n. 21, 61 n. 171; *38f.*: 60 n. 169, 78 n. 106; *39*: 56 n. 135.

Podagra: *140-174*: 127 n. 122.

Prom. Cauc.: 158f., 163 nn. 38, 41, 184 n. 5. *4*: 26 n. 32, 29 n. 57, 46; *5*: 15 n. 100; *6*: 53 n. 110, 54 n. 116, 128 n. 124, 178 n. 5; *20*: 26 n. 32, 49 n. 71.

Prom. es: 15 n. 104, 162 n. 37, 178.

Pisc.: 48, 101 n. 96, 141-148, 152, 153 n. 11, 160f., 162 n. 36, 164, 182-6. *1*: 62 n. 179; *1ff.*: 37 n. 115, 92, 121 n. 64; *2f.*: 163 n. 39; *3*: 110 n. 61; *4*: 170 n. 19; *5*: 110 n. 60; *9*: 63 n. 194; *10*: 91 n. 9; *12*: 67 n. 6, 122 n. 76; *13*: 34 n. 91, 56 n. 138, 67 n. 6; *14*: 67 n. 6, 151; *15*: 91 n. 12; *17*: 93 n. 24; *19*: 78 n. 110, 117 n. 29; *19f.*: 118 n. 39; *22*: 29 n. 59, 118; *24*: 9 n. 64; *29ff.*: 110 n. 62; *31-37*: 77 n. 102; *32*: 18 n. 126, 42 n. 12, 68 n. 14, 71 n. 37, 75 n. 89; *34*: 86 n. 15, 169 n. 10; *35*: 11 n. 79, 68 n. 13; *36*: 169 n. 10; *40ff.*: 105 n. 15; *41*: 108 n. 42; *41ff.*: 46 n. 46, 63 n. 188; *42*: 12 n. 86, 123 n. 83; *47ff.*: 30, 32 n. 79, 107 n. 33, 108 n. 42, 130 n. 141; *48*: 122 n. 80; *48ff.*: 121 n. 68; *52*: 158 n. 26.

Pseudolog.: 69f., 132f., 160f. *5*: 29 n. 58, 63 n. 187, 169 n. 10; *5ff.*: 48 n. 67, 56 n. 134, 60 n. 163, 65 n. 203, 71 n. 40; *7*: 63 n. 196, 161; *8*: 63 n. 191, 130 n. 142; *15*: 114 n. 4; *19*: 19 n. 136, 46 n. 45, 48 n. 67, 71 n. 40, 75 n. 89; *24*: 95 n. 35; *25*: 11 n. 81, 25 n. 18, 129 n. 137; *25f.*: 107 n. 31; *29*: 69 n. 29, 70 n. 35, 109 n. 55.

Rh. Pr.: 68-71, 115 nn. 11, 13, 138 and n. 32, 183 n. 4. *5*: 41; *6*: 67 n. 6; *6ff.*: 33 n. 84; *6-11*: 138 nn. 28-31, 165; *6-14*: 18 n. 131; *6-25*: 18 n. 132; *9*: 119 n. 46; *12*: 18 n. 126; *12ff.*: 184 n. 10; *17*: 4 n. 19, 78 n. 108, 130 n. 145, 132 n. 156, 180; *18*: 15 n. 101; *26*: 165.

Sacr.: 11 n. 81. *8*: 114 n. 10, 170 n. 15; *9*: 87 n. 24, 120 n. 54, 123 n. 83; *14*: 19 n. 143, 21 n. 152.

Salt.: *27*: 53 n. 110; *34*: 100 n. 84; *55*: 100 n. 90; *83*: 61 n. 175.

Sat.: 152-4, 162 n. 37, 164, 166 n. 45. *1*: 131 n. 151; *1-10*: 166 n. 45; *7*: 99, 100 n. 88, 120 n. 57; *10*: 77 n. 97; *15*: 159 n. 29; *19ff.*: 77 n. 97; *25*: 83 n. 143; *28*: 11 n. 74, 88 n. 27; *30*: 86 n. 10, 88 n. 27; *36ff.*: 15 n. 98; *38*: 87 n. 24.

Scytha: 82 n. 136, 166. *2*: 33ff., 71 n. 41, 75 n. 84, 93 n. 25, 173 n. 38; *3*: 92 n. 18; *3-8*: 56; *5*: 42 n. 8; *6*: 56 n. 138; *11*: 32 n. 79.

Sol.: 72 n. 41.

Sostratus: 166 n. 46.

Somnium (*seu Vita*): 11 n. 81, 138, 165. *2*: 80 n. 122; *3*: 44 n. 24; *5*: 81; *5-15*: 138 nn. 28-31; *6*: 67 n. 6; *14*: 94 n. 28; *15*: 29 n. 59, 42 n. 8; *17*: 25 n. 21.

Timon: 11 n. 81, 83, 90-94, 141, 143-8, 152 n. 7, 157, 160, 162 n. 36, 164, 171 n. 24, 177, 180, 182. *1*: 12 n. 85; *1-5*: 14 n. 96; *1-7*: 103 n. 4; *1-10*: 83 n. 140; *4*: 34 n. 93, 81 n. 123; *4-7*: 83 n. 137; *5*: 34 n. 94, 122 n. 81; *5-9*: 163 n. 39; *6f.*: 108 n. 49; *7ff.*: 19 n. 143; *8*: 34 n. 94, 83 n. 141; *9*: 56 n. 134, 68 n. 13, 70 n. 33; *10*: 55 n. 128; *11*: 14 n. 91; *13*: 129 n. 134; *14*: 87 n. 20; *18*: 35 nn. 99, 101, 121 n. 69; *19*: 50 n. 84; *20*: 30 n. 63, 129 n. 131; *22*: 70 n. 36, 87 n. 22, 122 n. 80; *23*: 88 n. 35; *33*: 89 n. 40; *34*: 97 n. 55; *35-37*: 83 n. 137; *37*: 117 n. 36; *37f.*: 47 n. 141; *38*: 83 n. 138; *39ff.*: 107f.; *41ff.*: 83 n. 138; *42ff.*: 83 n. 141; *43*: 159 n. 29; *45*: 105; *45ff.*: 12 n. 86, 46 n. 46, 49 n. 76, 106 n. 26; *45-58*: 45 n. 37; *47*: 79 n. 112; *50*: 37 n. 114, 49 n. 72; *50ff.*: 47 n. 61; *51*: 34 n. 93, 75 n. 83, 88 n. 36; *54*: 11 n. 79; *58*: 97 n. 55.

Tox.: 37, 59, 82 and n. 136, 140, 156f., 166. *2*: 20, 35 n. 97; *6*: 35f., 163 n. 39; *8*: 11 n. 78; *9*: 18 n. 126, 20 n. 144, 55 n. 128, 115 n. 15; *12-18*: 49ff.; *15*: 50 n. 78; *16*: 49 n. 76; *18*: 26 n. 30; *20*: 39 n. 129; *25*: 127 n. 118; *28*: 49 n. 73; *30*: 127 n. 117; *30ff.*: 50; *31f.*: 26 n. 30; *34*: 54 n. 123; *35*: 114 n. 5; *36*: 169 n. 9; *37*: 120 n. 55; *38*: 20 n. 150, 115 n. 15, 120 n. 55, 169 n. 9; *40*: 86 n. 12; *42*: 35 n. 100, 169 n. 9; *44ff.*: 37 n. 112; *44-55*: 60 n. 161, 97 n. 53; *46*: 60 n. 165; *48*: 120 n. 55; *51*: 127 n. 117; *53*: 2 n. 4, 127 n. 118; *54*: 38 n. 118; *56*: 38 n. 118; *56*: 82 n. 134; *59*: 19 n. 140; *62*: 2 n. 4, 109 n. 56; *63*: 82 n. 134.

Tyrann.: 166 n. 46. *21f.*: 60 n. 164.

VH: 6, 7 n. 51, 11 n. 81, 12, 15 n. 105, 23ff., 31, 37, 39, 60, 121 n. 67, 140, 164, 169 n. 11, 174, 177. *Praef.*: 179. *I. 2f.*: 179 n. 7; *3*: 57 n. 141, 79 n. 114; *4*: 116 n. 25, 128 n. 127; *6-9*: 39; *7*: 34 n. 94, 35 n. 97, 99; *8*: 27, 71 n. 39, 95 n. 42; *11*: 2 n. 2; *11ff.*: 29 n. 57, 121 n. 67, 169 n. 11; *12*: 129 n. 133, 26 n. 28; *13*: 37 n. 112, 60 n. 160; *13ff.*: 91 n. 10; *15*: 26, 27 n. 35; *16*: 38 n. 118, 60 n. 166; *18*: 27 n. 38, 32 n. 81, 60 n. 168; *19*: 27 n. 34; *20*: 35 n. 99; *21f.*: 26 n. 26; *22*: 28, 33 n. 84, 95 n. 41, 96 n. 43; *22ff.*: 121 n. 60; *23*: 26 n. 29, 54 n. 119; *25*: 16 n. 113, 26 n. 27, 36 n. 108, 60 n. 166, 86 n. 12; *26*: 17 n. 114, 24 n. 12; *28*: 14 n. 95; *29*: 27 n. 34, 129 n. 133; *32*: 35 n. 100; *34*: 25 n. 21; *35*: 30 n. 64; *37*: 60 n. 166; *38*: 27 n. 38; *41*: 32 n. 81; *42*: 27 n. 38. *II. 4*: 28 n. 52, 44 n. 31; *5ff.*: 121 n. 60; *6*: 18 n. 130, 60 n. 166; *7ff.*: 151 n. 5; *8*: 32 n. 81; *9*: 129 n. 133; *12*: 26 n. 29, 54 n. 119; *15*: 12 n. 84; *18*: 12 n. 84, 48 n. 68, 115 n. 18; *19*: 26 n. 27; *20*: 14 n. 90, 17 n. 121,

127, 129 n. 136, 170 n. 15; *22*: 63 n. 193; *23*: 37 n. 115, 62 n. 179, 100 nn. 79, 82; *25*: 50f., 52 n. 94; *26*: 74 n. 77; *28*: 26 n. 31, 94 n. 30, 126 n. 113; *29*: 50, 54 n. 120; *31*: 11 n. 81, 28 n. 51; *34*: 42 n. 8, 156 n. 21; *35*: 16 n. 111; *36*: 50; *41*: 39 n. 130, 71 n. 39; *45*: 28 n. 52, 74 n. 75; *46*: 18, 95 n. 42; *47*: 61 n. 171.

Vit. Auct.: 10 n. 70, 11, 63, 71 n. 37, 102 n. 104, 152, 165, 172. *3ff.*: 15 n. 97, 165; *4*: 20 n. 149, 120 n. 55; *7*: 91 n. 12; *15-18*: 67 n. 10; *17*: 81; *18*: 16 n. 113; *25*: 94 n. 28; *27*: 109 n. 54.

Zeuxis: *2*: 162 n. 33; *3*: 39 n. 128; *4f.*: 29 n. 57; *4ff.*: 169 n. 11; *5f.*: 36; *6*: 15 n. 100; *8ff.*: 37, 46 n. 48; *9f.*: 60 n. 168.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

The names of authors appear only when they themselves are used as characters.

Abdera, 61
Academy, 149
Achaea, 59, 89
Acharnae, 91
Achilles, 42, 99, 126, 169
Accounting, see Logismos
Acropolis, 12, 30, 106f.
Adeimantus, 16, 36, 78, 107, 155ff., 174
Adrian of Tyre, 71 n. 40
Adyrmachus, 127
Aeacus, 99, 139 n. 35, 185
Aeschylus, 98
Aetion, 118
Aetolians, 96
Afranius Silo, 60
Agamemnon, 99
Agathocles (faithful friend), 49ff.
Agathocles of Sicily, 45
Agora, 62
Ajax, 99, 170f.
Alcaeus, 42
Alcibiades, 20, 43, 47, 88, 95 n. 40, 97, 148
Alcidamas, 74, 97, 147f., 151
Alethion, 78
Alexander of Abonoteichos, 15, 17, 19, 53f., 60, 63, 70, 72ff., 76, 80, 86, 96, 109
Alexander the Great, 30, 38, 41f., 47f., 72, 76, 81, 98, 101, 115 n. 18, 116, 119, 123, 138, 139 n. 35, 157, 163f., 171f., 178
Alexander Peloplaton, 4, 69, 71 n. 40
Alexicles, 51
Alexandria, 40
Alexandrian dwarf, 88
Alpha, 93, 129
Amastris, 36, 80
Amphilochus, 125
Amymone, 101
Anacharsis, 19, 33, 56, 82, 92, 114f., 154f., 157
Anakeion, 90
Anaxagoras, 90f.
Anniceris of Cyrene, 88
Antipodes, 13
Antiochus, 69
Anubis, 20
Anytus, 91
Apelles, 33, 44, 47
Aphrodite, 14, 17 n. 114, 28, 51, 64, 93, 129 n. 134
— of Praxiteles, 50
Apollo, 64, 76, 95, 124, 169
Apollonius of Tyana, 25, 28, 35 n. 99, 39 n. 128, 52f., 64 n. 199
Arbakes, 57, 59
Arcadia, 110
Arcadian women, 28
Archidamus, 62
Archimedes, 130
Architeles, 33, 34 and n. 90
Aridaeus-myth, 25
Areopagus, 16 n. 113, 91, 117
Ares, 17 n. 114, 28, 51, 63f.
Aristeas, 54
Aristippus, 17
Aristobulus, 47f.
Aristocles of Pergamum, 81
Aristodemus, 19
Aristides the Just, 91, 106
Arrow, 20
Arsacomas, 97
Arsakes, 37f., 57, 59
Arsinoe, 136 n. 8
Artaxerxes, 57
Artemis, 130
Artoxares, 57
Asclepius, 55, 126, 169, 171, 173f.
Aspasia, 126
Asslegs, 118
Athena, 14, 36, 61
Athenians, 37, 45, 93, 106, 155, 157
Athena, 14, 36, 61, 99, 103
Athens, 16, 34, 35, 36, 40, 45, 64 n. 199, 69 n. 31, 78, 86, 89, 114, 121, 133, 154, 170, 174
Athos, 47, 56
Attic setting, 34, 86ff., 90, 144

Attic usage, 129
Attica, 12, 78
Augustus, 185
Avitus, 17

Babylon, 13, 41f., 78, 121, 123
Bactria, 126, 170
Baetica, 61
Bagoas, 62f., 98, 123, 161
Battus, 124
Berenice, 47
Bithynia, 9
Biton, 58
Black Sea, 35f.
Brahmans, 54f.

Caligula, 185
Callias, 43, 91
Callimorphus, 78, 117 n. 32
Calypso, 50
Cantharus, 10, 12, 51, 70, 93, 108, 109 n. 57, 126
Cappadocians, 38
Caria, 124
Cerameicus, 34
Chaereas, 38 n. 124, 59
Chance (Tyche), 32 n. 78
Charicleia, 50f., 136 n. 7
Charon, 11, 17, 33, 36, 39, 56, 81f., 92f., 101, 105, 110, 119f., 122, 129, 137f., 139 n. 35, 151, 156, 168, 170
Charops, 91
Chelidonion, 29
Chians, 62
Chimaera, 17
Chiron, 99f., 120, 174
Chloe, 136 n. 8
Chremylus, 92
Christians, 26, 50, 73, 75, 76, 180
Chrysippus, 115 n. 18
Chrysis, 51f.
Cinyras, 28, 50f., 74
Circe, 18
Clarus, 125
Claudius, 112
Cleinias, 18 n. 132
Cleobis, 58
Cleocritus, 58
Cleodemus, 51, 165
Cleon, 91, 131
Cleopatra, 45
Clitus, 171
Clonarium, 95f.
Clotho, 150f., 156, 185
Cloudcuckootown, 23, 25
Clouds, 49
Cnemon, 93f.
Coconnas, 73, 76
Colossus of Rhodes, 98
Comedy, 53, 54 n. 116, 162
Compliments (*Epainoi*), 33
Corinna, 94
Corinth, 61, 64 n. 199, 121, 170
Crates, 126
Crepereius, 77, 78
Crete, 39
Croesus, 58, 67, 91 n. 7, 98, 116, 124f.
Cronius, 160
Cronos, 77, 83, 99, 120, 152ff.
Cybelus, 107
Cyclops, 50, 98
Cydias, 137f.
Cydimachus, 58
Cynics, 9, 15, 51, 56, 88, 110, 114, 116, 122, 148, 160
Cyniscus, 9, 63, 67, 106, 150f., 165
Cyrus, 17, 58, 123
Cupid(s), 81, 118
Culture (Paideia), 67 n. 6

Daedalus, 14
Damianus, 71 n. 38
Damis, 16 n. 113, 40, 63, 174
Danaids, 35 and n. 99
Daphne, 27
Daphnis, 136 n. 8
Death, 20
Deimainete, 33ff., 136 n. 8
Deinias, 49, 50f., 129
Delium, 100
Delphi, 125, 170
Demeas, 47, 51
Demetrius, (Cynic philosopher), 47
Demetrius, (faithful friend), 127
Demetrius Poliorcetes, 87
Demetrius of Sagalassus, 78
Democritus, 64 n. 199
Demonax, 52, 63ff., 123, 166 n. 46, 178
Demonax, (type-name), 51
Demosthenes, 138
Dialogue, 32, 101, 153, 162
Dicaeopolis, 6, 19
Didyma, 125
Didymus, 68 n. 22
Diespiter, 185

Diocles, 62, 98
Diogenes, 9, 12, 45, 50, 61f., 67, 98, 102 n. 104, 126, 139, 142, 144, 164f., 171
Dionysodorus, 130
— (philosopher), 147
Dionysius of Syracuse, 17, 61
Dionysus, 19, 34, 61, 95, 102, 104f., 109, 111 n. 67, 136, 140, 148, 151
Dioscorides, 68 n. 22, 70
Dioscuri, 99
Diotima, 34, 148
Diphilus, 74
Dipylon, 34
Dorcon, 136 n. 8
Dorio, 97
Doris, 139 n. 34
Dreams, 42
Dromo, 70
Drunkenness, 149

Empedocles, 15, 17, 23 n. 3, 29, 31, 42, 54f., 68, 71 n. 41, 73, 75 and n. 79, 93, 99, 110, 149, 151
Empusa, 151
Encolpius, 87
Endymion, 126
Epeius, 130
Ephesus, 71 n. 40
Ephialtes 68, 91 n. 7
Epicharmus, 157
Epicureans, 100, 120, 126, 174f., 183 n. 4
Epicurus, 125
Eros, 36, 100
Eryximachus, 48, 147
Ethiopia, 13, 121, 141
Ethiopians, 121
Etna, 93
Eucrates, 16, 17 n. 114, 30, 49 n. 72, 60f., 75, 80, 88, 108, 119, 122, 126, 146
Eucritus, 49 n. 72
Euktemon, 78
Eumelus, 43, 46
Eumolpids, 86
Euphorbus, 63, 126, 169f.
Euripides, 47, 61
Europa, 13, 100
Europus, 59
Evangelus, 43f.

False Philosophy, 67 n. 6
False Education, 18
Fates, 13, 27
Favorinus, 63, 65
Fortune, 12

Gadeirans, 37 n. 117
Galatians, 37
Galen, 71 n. 41
Galloi, 130, 168
Ganymede, 81, 93, 95, 101
Gate of Dreams, 25
Gaul, 31, 33, 133
Gelo, 41, 94
Geminus, 68 n. 22
Getae, 13
Glaucias, 51
Glycon, 73, 111, 126
Gnathonides, 91
Gnipho, 146
Gnostics, 76
Gyges, 30, 137, 156

Hades, 15, 29, 51, 65, 98ff., 104ff., 109, 110, 111 n. 67, 116, 121, 125, 139, 151, 157, 165, 170, 175, 185
Haemus, 51
Halter, 20
Hannibal, 38, 98, 101, 163, 171f.
Harmonides, 44
Hecataeus, 78 n. 108
Hecate, 32
Helen, 50ff., 169
Heliopolis, 23
Helios, 99f., 171
Hellenodikai, 42, 56
Hemlock, 20
Hephaestus, 28, 51, 63f., 93, 158
Hera, 101, 103
Heracles, 10, 34, 42, 52 n. 102, 54f., 75 n. 79, 76, 95, 98f., 102 n. 104, 104, 109, 112, 126, 129, 139 n. 35, 171, 174, 185f.
Heraclitus, 120
Heramithras, 38
Hermaphroditus, 28 n. 49, 95
Hermagoras (Hermes Agoraeus), 105, 110, 148
Hermes, 12, 14, 16 n. 113, 17, 21, 50ff., 56, 61, 64, 81f., 93, 99ff., 102 n. 104, 103ff., 106, 108, 110, 119, 120, 129, 137, 143f., 150f., 156, 158f., 169f., 186 n. 13
Hermocrates, 87

Hermotimus, 16 n. 113, 35 and n. 99, 51, 81, 83, 115 n. 18, 121
Herodes Atticus, 4, 65 and n. 207, 69 n. 26, 71 nn. 38, 40
Herodian, 68 n. 23
Herodotus, 182
Hesiod, 14, 125, 165
Hetoemocles, 147f.
Hiera, 169
Hiero, 41 n. 4
Hippodromus, 4
Hipponicus, 91
Histiaeus, 105, 147f.
Homer, 14f., 17, 40, 47, 82, 119, 125ff., 129, 165, 169f.
Homonoia, 60
Hope, 67 n. 6
Hyades, 24
Hymenaeus, 93
Hymettus, 78
Hyperbolus, 91

Iapetus, 169
Icarus, 31
Ilissus, 154
India, 13, 42, 55, 61, 100, 180
Indians, 25, 37 and n. 116
Indopatres, 38
Interest, see Tokos
Io, 21
Ion of Chios, 23 n. 3, 24, 29, 105
Ion (Platonist), 147f., 165
Ionia, 59
Ionian revolt, 78 n. 108
Ionopolis, 60
Ipola, 61
Iris, 139 n. 33
Isis (ship), 39
Isles of the Blest, 6, 12, 16, 25, 40, 50, 51, 54, 87
Italy, 13, 36

Janus, 185
Joessa, 96, 139 n. 34
Justice, 12, 89, 106

Kerukes, 86
Kraneion, 61, 78
Ktesikles, 78
Ktesippus, 78
Kteson, 78

Leaena, 95
Lebadeia, 99
Leda, 68
Lekythion, 108
Lepidus, 126
Lerna, 78
Lesbos, 5, 95 n. 40
Leto, 101
Lexiphanes, 53, 68, 69, 80, 103, 107, 122, 129f., 161
Libyan desert, 35
Libyans, 127
Logismos (Accounting), 93, 129
Logoi, 18, 136 and n. 11, 183
Logos, see Argument
Lotus-eaters, 27
Lucian, as character, 12, 14, 17 nn. 114, 118
Lucius, 130
Lycaenion, 136 n. 8
Lychnopolis, 23ff., 89
Lycinus, 16 and n. 113, 17, 31, 36, 38, 41, 78, 81, 83, 103, 106f., 111, 119, 130, 137, 147, 155-8, 161, 174
Lycurgus, 115, 155
Lynceus, 92
Lysias, 96, 139 n. 34, 184
Lysimachus, 47
Lysippus, 47

Macedonia, 35
Maea, 100
Maeandrius, 58
Maenads, 37
Malea, 39 and n. 128
Malice 32 n. 78
Maltese, 16
Marathon, 4
Marcus Aurelius, 62, 71 n. 41, 172
Marcus of Byzantium, 65 n. 207
Marriage of Alexander and Roxana, 118
Marsyas, 48
Mausacus, 60
Megabyzus, 70
Megacles, 58
— another, 70
Megapenthes, 17 n. 114, 46, 51, 58, 63, 67, 99, 126
Megarians, 97
Megilla, 95, 96
Meidias, 91
Menippus, 6, 9f., 12, 14, 17, 19, 23 n. 3, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 50, 51, 53,

57, 61, 67, 68, 78, 81, 92f., 95, 103f., 110, 111 n. 57, 112, 122, 125, 138ff., 149, 150f., 158, 162, 170
Mercury, 185
Messengers of the Dead, 54
Meletus, 91
Menander, 126
Micyllus, 14, 16, 17 n. 114, 30f., 36, 49, 67, 81, 84, 88, 95, 100, 105ff., 110, 137, 145f., 150f., 156, 168, 170
Miletus, 61, 78 n. 108
Minos, 17, 165, 139 n. 35
Mithraic Mysteries, 29 n. 53
Mithrobarzanes, 51
Mnesilochus, 6
Mnesitheus, 39
Momus, 129, 148 n. 68, 159 n. 29, 164
Moonmen (Selenites), 16 and 113, 26, 33 n. 84, 36, 54, 86, 96
Musonius, 64 n. 199
Myrmidons, 138
Myropnous, 108
Myrtale, 97
Myrtion, 139 n. 34
Mys, 124
Mysteries, 62, 64f., 129

Neanthus, 43
Neo-Pythagoreans, 55 n. 133
Nephelokokkygia, 27 n. 34
Nereid-Harpies, 27
Nero, 37 n. 117, 185
New Socrates, 75
Nicaea, 60
Nicander, 128
Nicostratus, 42
Nigrinus, 7 n. 49, 17 n. 118, 45, 81, 111, 114
Nile, 13, 30
Nikias, 131
Notus, 13, 40, 139 n. 33

Odysseus, 17, 24, 50, 129, 168, 170f.
Oeta, 52
Ogmios, 31
Olympia, 13, 34, 73, 92
Olympians, 37 n. 117
Olympias, 172
Olympic Games, 13, 75, 92, 123
Olympio, 45
Olympus, 52, 76
Omphale, 33, 42, 95
Onesicritus, 47f.
Onomacritus, 124
Orestes, 35f.
Oresteion, 35
Orpheus, 12, 42, 43, 93, 104, 172
Ossa, 137
Othryades, 15
Otus, 68, 91 n. 7

Paideia, 42
Palamedes, 170f.
Pamphilus, 139 n. 34
Panathenaic Games, 42, 45
Panthea, 14, 19, 45, 71, 111, 118ff.
Paphlagonia, 70, 78 n. 110, 86, 126
Paphlagonians, 44, 73, 111
Paris, 14, 93
Parnassus, 52
Parrhesia, 93
Parrhesiades, 30, 78, 104, 108, 110, 142ff., 158
Parthia, 78
Parthian details, 38
Parthian War, 59, 77, 170, 177
Parthians, 60, 179
Patara, 61
Patroclus, 42 n. 10
Pelion, 52, 137
Pellichus, 75 n. 79, 130
Pelorus, 136 n. 7
Penelope, 50, 54
Penia (Poverty), 12, 32, 89, 93, 143, 145
Peregrinus, 15, 17 and n. 114, 19, 50, 52ff., 55, 56, 60, 63, 65 n. 207, 72ff., 78, 91 n. 7, 93, 99f., 109, 126ff., 160, 170, 180
Pergamum, 61, 87
Pericles, 90f.
Peripatetics, 116
Persia, 38
Persians, 38 n. 124, 85f., 137
Perseus, 94, 111
Phaethon, 100f., 171
Parmeno, 97
Phalaris, 75 n. 79, 170
Pharos, 46
Pheidippides, 58, 183
Phidias, 4, 138
Philagrus, 71 n. 40
Philetas, 44 n. 29
Philiades, 79 n. 112
Philinus, 79 n. 112

Philip of Macedon, 62, 163f., 171f.
Philippides, 131
Philippopolis, 108
Philo, 147
Philocles, 79 n. 112
Philosophy, 12, 56, 63, 67 n. 6, 89, 93, 107f., 142, 151, 164
Philostratus (merchant), 97
Phoenix, 13, 53
Phoenicians, 20, 69f., 109
Phrontisterion, 183
Phryne, 47
Phrynichus, 68 n. 23
Piraeus, 16, 78, 156, 162, 174
Platonists, 16 n. 113, 81
Pleasure, 149
Plethrion, 56
Ploutos (Wealth), 12, 50, 83, 91-94, 129, 141, 143ff., 146
Pluto, 139 n. 35, 148
Polemo (soldier), 97
Polemo (sophist), 68, 70f.
Pollux (demigod), 50
Pollux (rhetor), 68 n. 22f., 71 n. 39
Polus, 19
Polyclitus, 44
Polydorus, 28
Polyktetes, 78
Polyphemus, 33, 44, 97
Polystratus, 87, 119
Pompeiopolis, 78
Ponos, 93
Poseidon, 101
Potheinus, 70, 71 n. 39
Pothos, 93
Poverty, (see Penia)
Praxiteles, 50
Priapus, 95
Procrustes, 149
Prometheus, 149, 158f.
Protarchus, 70
Protesilaus, 99, 139, 169
Proteus, 51, 72
Providence, 83, 100, 108, 153, 164
Pseudologist, 19, and see Atimarchus
Ptolemy, 46, 47
Ptolemy Lagus, 130
Pylades, 35
Pyriphlegethon, 17
Pyrrhias, 70, 109
Pyrrhus, 42, 131
Pythagoras, 15 and n. 97, 36, 55, 60, 62, 73f., 93, 95, 110, 125f., 128, 145 and n. 60, 146, 165
Pythagoreans, 26
Pythias, 96

Rhadamanthys, 63, 91
Rhetoric, 14, 33, 67 n. 6, 153
Rho, 107, 129
Rome, 45, 52, 62, 81, 85-89, 111
Romans, 17f., 45, 71, 85-89, 161, 179
Roxana, 118f.
Runners of the Dead, 54
Rutilianus, 17, 126

Sacerdos, 73, 124, 126
St. Elmo's Fire, 39
Sagalassus, 78
Salmacis, 28 n. 49
Samippus, 30, 38f., 76, 78, 97, 137f., 157
Sardanapalus, 57, 58 n. 150, 59
Sardis, 123
Satyrs, 102
Scamander, 99
Scintharus, 35, 52
Scimitar, 20
Scipio, 98, 101, 171f.
Scopelian, 87, 91 n. 6, 126 n. 114
Sculpture, 18
Scythia, 35
Scythian (language), 127
Scythians, 4, 20, 35f., 37, 45, 49, 59, 82, 85f., 97, 115, 157, 163 n. 39, 166
Sea, 99
Selene, 126, 172
Selenites, see Moonmen
Seleucus, 130
Semele, 55
Semiramis, 37 n. 116
Severianus, 60
Sibylline oracle, 125
Sicilian Expedition, 116, 118
Sicily, 170
Sidonians, 41
Sigma, 17f., 107, 129, 170
Silenus, 7 n. 49, 12, 20, 100f., 122, 171
Simon, 17 n. 114, 54, 70, 86, 88, 109, 137, 145f.
Simonides, 70, 86
Sirens, 18
Sphacteria, 131
Snakewomen, 27

Sopolis, 71 n. 41, 107
Socrates, 16, 18 and n. 132, 20, 31, 43, 45, 48, 53, 54, 62f., 67, 68, 75 n. 81, 100 and n. 79, 103ff., 106, 120, 122, 126, 128, 136, 148, 156, 183
Solon, 56, 82, 114f., 120, 154f.
Sophia, 93
Sophocles, 98
Sostratus, robber, 17, 139, 165
Sostratus of Cnidos, 46, 130
Sparta, 154
Spartans, 62, 115, 155
Spatinus, 57, 59
Spear, 20
Statilius Crito, 79
Stoa, 149, 174
Stoics, 7, 49, 83, 174, 183 n. 4
Stratonice, 42, 45, 96, 115, 123, 148
Strepsiades, 16, 49, 136, 183
Styx, 105
Sulla, 36
Sybarites, 61
Syllogisms, 104, 143
Syracusans, 45
Syracuse, 61
Syria, 13, 121
Syrians, 69, 97

Tantalus, 35 and n. 99
Tartarus, 28, 91
Tau, 18, 25, 78, 93, 107, 129
Taurians, 35
Tellus of Athens, 58
Thales, 130
Theagenes, 52f., 56, 60, 73ff., 105, 125, 160f.
Thebans, 37, 171
Thersippus, 58
Thersites, 42
Thesmopolis, 49, 81, 146 n. 63
Thessalians, 97
Thisbe, 136 n. 8
Thmuis, 70
Thoas, 35
Thrace, 107f.
Thracians, 37f.
Thyamis, 136 n. 7
Thucydides, 17, 129, 170
Tibeius, 70
Tibius, 97
Tillorobus, 38, 73
Timocles, 16 n. 113, 39, 63, 74, 102 n. 104, 115, 174
Timolaus, 13, 30f., 137, 157
Timon, 12, 14, 33, 34, 37, 47, 49, 70, 75, 83, 84, 88, 91-94, 100, 103, 105, 107f., 117, 141, 143ff., 146, 171
Timotheus (general), 32 n. 78
— (musician), 186
Tiresias, 95, 99, 140
Tisiphone, 151
Titans, 33, 100
Tokos (Interest), 93, 129
Tomyris, 17, 58
Toxaris, 20, 26, 33f., 42, 55 n. 128, 71 n. 41, 75, 82, 93, 115, 169
Trajan, 79
Trachinus, 136 n. 7
Trimalchio, 87f.
Troad, 170
Trophonius, 99, 125, 139 n. 35
Troy, 109
True Education, 18
Trygaeus, 23f., 29, 53f., 103, 137 n. 21, 140
Tychiades, 78, 113, 156
Tyre, 38 n. 124
Tyrians, 69 n. 32

Ulpianism, 70
Umbricius, 89
Upsilon, 93, 129
Utopia, 23, 26, 121, 180

Victory, 143

Wrath, 14
Wealth, see Ploutos
Wind, 20

Xanthippe, 45
Xanthus, 151, 75 n. 79
Xi, 17, 129, 170
Xois, 70

Zenothemis, 17, 147
Zephyrus, 13, 40, 139 n. 33
Zeus, 11, 13f., 16, 19, 34, 39, 53, 55 n. 128, 56, 68, 73, 76, 83, 87, 90ff., 95, 99ff., 102 n. 104, 103, 105f., 108, 110, 112, 120 n. 53, 126, 139f., 143, 146, 148 n. 68, 149, 153, 158f., 164f., 171, 174, 183, 186
Zeuxis, 36, 119

INDEX OF PRINCIPAL MOTIFS

This list is selective, and the descriptions themselves are arbitrary: a full index on Stith-Thompson principles would have been as long as the book. I have opted for a list short enough to be *read* in the first instance rather than consulted; and concentrated on passages which contain discussion of cross-references.

Actor image, 4f., 10, 12, 14, 18ff., 23, 37, 44, 53, 61, 68, 73, 75, 80, 103, 112

Adulterer unmasked, 17, 28, 51, 64, 106. See also Lovers caught in the act

After-Life, 7 n. 51

Allegorical debate, 18, 138f.

Allegorical figures as supporting cast, 93, cf. 12, 129

Animal anecdotes, 45f.

Animal gods, 19ff.

Animal hybrids, 18, 28ff., 36, 112, 119, 121, 169. Cf. 63

Animal metamorphoses, 21, 168ff. Pet animal used to disconcert someone, 36

Animal sophistication, 14, 168ff.

Animal virtues, 168

Anonymous stranger interrupts, 63, 125, 161

Ant-simile, 24f.

Appropriate figures (for a particular region), 12

Artist alters his work, 44, 46

Artist anecdotes, 44, 46f.

Ass in lion's skin, 10

Assembly interrupted, 63

Athletics attacked, 88, 114ff., 123

'Attic' decorations, 34, 86ff., 90ff.

Author in league with his character, 17, 129, 170

Bald ruler's wig, 45

Barbarians bewildered: by Greek institutions, 19, 37, 45, 82; by a secret weapon, 37, cf. 60, 179; excluded from the mysteries, 64f.

Bizarre funeral rites, 52ff., 60

Bogus chronology, 169

Bogus history, 37, 47, 57, 77ff., 130

Bogus inscriptions, 34f., 40, 46, 124

Bogus oracles, 55, 73, 105, 124ff., 180, cf. 79

Bogus ritual, 29, 34, 52ff., 74f., 93

Borrowed eyes, 86

Borrowed plumes, 29

Boundary disputes, 129, 138

Bride's embarrassment, 118, 119 n. 45

Bubbles simile, 23f.

Casual mention (of an important subject), 14.

Casual messenger, 50, 171f. Cf. 54

Cautious friend intervenes, 137

Chain murders, 57ff.

Change of name, 54, 70, 109

Change of speaker, 14

Cheating a vain performer, 48

Children's toys, 81

Chores of the gods, 13f.

Chorus-simile, 23f.

Colossus with rubbish inside, 18, 20, 46, cf. 42, 122

Comic battles, 26f., 37, 45f., 47, 60, 91, 97, 116, 121, 128, 157, 174, 162

Comic deification, 172

Comic conversion-scenes, 83f., 104

Comic oaths, 20, 120

Comic transmigrations, 15, 21, 126, 168ff.

Conversions, 80f. Cf. also Comic conversion-scenes

Correcting one's vision, 122, cf. 120

Corroborative detail, 24, 27, 39f., 52, 56, 62, 64, 78f., 130, 180. Cf. 21

'Counter-banquet', 129

Countering a proclamation, 104ff., 125, 142, 151, 160

Courtesan v. modest woman, 118, cf. 20, 122

Court intrigue, 38, 57ff.
Criticism of Homer, 15, 169
Crucified sophist, 26
Curious exorcisms, 48

Dancing gods, 100
Diatribe themes, 7f., 138, 156f., 162
Diatribe types, 146
Debate over precedence, 98, 101, 171
Dialogue-promenade, 154f.
Disappearing into thin air, 54
Discarded shoe, 122, 126
Doctor simile, 43, 173
'Dragging' motif, 32, 36, 119
Dreams, 30, 37; Island of, 25; Vain dreams, 107, 123, 156; Dreams of wealth interrupted, 16, 156

Eccentric performers, 48
Eidolopoiia, 119
Elaborate façade simile, 18, 20
Emended proclamations, 46. Cf. countering a proclamation
Enforced silence, 99
Escape from dinner under pretext of a fire, 88
Eunuch as adulterer, 62. Cf. Eunuch's concubine, 123
Eunuch's intrigues, 57ff.
Excuse for not wielding the thunderbolt, 83, 91
Excuse for resigning immortality, 99f.
Exotic details, 13, 38, cf. 55
Exposing charlatans, 15, 106ff.; Exposure scenes, 142, 148, 154, 157, 159, 160

Faithful friend, 49f., cf. 26
Fantastic battles, 37, 78. Cf. Comic battles.
Fantastic flights, 6, 14, 28ff., 31, 52ff., 121
Fantastic revelations, 109ff., 157
Fantastic ships, 28, 174
Fantastic shortcuts, 41
Faux pas, 11, 87, 130ff.
Fictitious authorities, 130
Fictitious correspondence, 152f.
Fictitious monuments, 33ff., 40
Fictitious paintings, 31ff., 133; statues, 34, 75
Finding men who have not mourned, 64 n. 199
Fishing for surprise catch, 30, 107, 121f., 137
Flattery, 45, 47, 49, 87, 116
Flautist, 122
Fly-simile, 123
Folk-medicine, 29
Fool makes disastrous debut, 44; makes erudite enquires, 56, 128; wants to use too much magic, 137
Foreign cults, 19ff., 129
Foreign quack to the rescue, 34, 127. Cf. Guide emerging *ex machina*
Free speech, 118

Gay clothing worn in public, 42, 45
Gods as intercessors, 76f.; in fear of invasion, 111 n. 67; in two places at once, 98f., 172; overworked, 13, 153; arguing about repairs, 101
Golden vessel, 57f.
Golden chain, 32f., 120
Grotesque attachments, 30, 32f., 36, 120
Guide emerging *ex machina*, 42, 56; cf. also Meeting a stranger
Gymnasium as background, 154, cf. 129

Half-burnt figures, 55, 75 n. 79, 99, 110, 180. Cf. 126
Hellebore needed, 115
Hellenic institutions, 92, 154
Horse-racing, 88
Humble man as sophist, 14, 82, 109, 170

Impostor-scenes, 142. Cf. Exposure-scenes
Incongruous footwear, 44, cf. 93, 128f.
Incongruous pet animal, 16
Incongruous possessions, 123
Incongruous portraits of Heracles, 33, cf. 10, 42, 54, 95, 104
Infectious madness, 61, cf. 88
Inheritance scandals, 74
Inspired utterances, 103f., 110f., 145, 161f. Cf. 19
Intercourse with plants, 27f.
Interlocutor discovers new facet in his friend's character, 11 n. 78
Interrupting a flight of fancy, 103f. Cf. Dream of wealth interrupted

Intrigues at table, 50f.
Irrelevant reply, 127
Isles of the Blest, 24

Keeping the interlocutor in suspense, 95

Lamps, 23f.
Lessons in the Underworld, 125
Lies, 35, 37, 59, 61, 78, 113, 116, 180; told *metri gratia*, 14
Lion's skin, 128
Lost stranger, 92; cf. meeting a stranger
Lovers' accomplice, 51, 127
Lovers caught in the act, 27f., 50f., 62ff., 108. Cf. Adulterer unmasked, Spying on immorality
Lover deceived by disguise, 96
Lovers' intrigues, 49, 50f.
Lover's sexual naïvety, 94f.

Madman forces wise man to perform, 48
Magic decorations, 51
Magic feathers, 31, 106ff.; rings, 31; magic power of money, 52, 64; magic replaced afterwards, 52; sympathetic magic, 128
Man and bird combined, 29, 112
Man who puts towns in wrong place, 121
Meeting a stranger, 109-112, cf. 23, 29
Miles gloriosus, 37f., 97
'Milking' proverbs, 123
Miraculous cures 29ff., 34
Miraculous vision, 16f. Cf. Oculist, Sharpsightedness
Misbehaving at dinner, 58f., 97, 147
Mock decrees, 34, 104, 125, 152
Mock trials, 18, 25, 129, 161

Nautical clichés, 39f.
Nautical simile, 39, 43, 129
New Comic father, 52
Nomenclator, 86

Oculist, 81, 129
Oracles, 108f.
Oriental intrigues, 38, 57ff.

'Pairs' of exempla, 91
Parvenus, 88
Patient idealist withdraws from the scene, 12, 89, cf. 93
Patron protects cultured criminal, 17, 90f.
Perfect woman, 121
Performer given a timely reminder, 11 n. 78
Periplous-literature, 16, 27
'Philological' variations, 18, 25, 30, 129
Philosopher auctioned, 11; in battle, 62f., 100; his beard, 63, 77, 122; compared to a tragic actor, 10; his crimes reported in heaven, 11; dragged off as a slave, 11; hooked by bait, 30, 32, cf. 46, 63, 108; his jargon, 11; as lover's accomplice, 51; his quarrels, 64; stock features shared with rhetorician, 67f., and historian, 77
Platonic appeals to friendship, 11 n. 78, 103
Pompous idiot makes a fool of himself in public, 42ff., 46
Postponing an embarrassing decision, 63
Prayers only audible from a special place, 64
Pretending to select information, 113f.
Pretender in elaborate disguise, 10, 42, 46, 104, 109ff., 119. Cf. 122
Pretender exposed, 47, 63, 103; cf. Exposure scenes
Pretended eyewitness, 55f., 59, 62, 78, 121, 128, 170
Pretentious jargon, 127
Professional quarrels (between fictitious characters), 170f.
Prologues to be curtailed, 117, 145
Proskynesis, 86
Puppet on the string, 13

Quack cures, 127f., 173. Cf. 29f., 75 n. 79

Recognition scenes, 24. Cf. Meeting a stranger
Referring the victim to a fellow-impostor, 125
Return from the underworld (*anod-*

os), 48, 54, 65, 116, 121f., 170, 174. Cf. 33
Rich boor, 87
Rich and poor, 11. Cf. 15, 23, 67, 83f., 92, 151, 153
Ring of Gyges, 30
Rising from the ranks, 38
Ritual prohibition, 26, 74, 94, 126
River of Wine, 35
Robbers, 38
Runaway slaves, 11, 104, 107f.
Rustic suitor, 97f.

Salutatio, 86f., cf. 89
Scholar turned flatterer, 11f., 86f., cf. 89
Scroll concealing tragedy, 18
Sea of milk, 35
Serpent-lore, 60, 76
Sexual curiosities, 28, 95
Sexual hybrids, 28, 36, 63, 95
Sharp-sightedness, 30, 55, 81, 92, 105, 122
Ship of State, 174
Si quis deus, 107
Significant figures, 81f., 126, 180. Cf. 39. See also Sixteen
Similes of Life, 23f.
Simile, over-elaborated, 115
Sixteen, proverbial number, 49, 180
Skill v. Sloth, 42f., cf. 173
Sleepless nights, 87
Slip of the tongue, 11, 161
Snake-bites, 76, 128
Sorcerer's apprentice, 105 n. 17
Spying on immorality from a vantage-point, 16f., 31, 58, 106, 172. Cf. 96
Statues destroyed, 46, cf. 42; attacked, 88, cf. 81, 115, 130, 180
Stealing a vessel, 20f., 49, 137
Storm-scenes, 39f.
Superfluous retinue, 86
Surprise intervention, 98, 105, cf. 106, 150f., 161, 172. Cf. also Patron protects cultured criminal
Swarm scenes, 12
Symposium ending in disaster, 57f., cf. 87
Symposium in the other world, 12

Tearing away a fool's book, 47
Temple-robbers, 20
Three-headed creatures, 2
Three ranks, 120, 129
Three wishes, 156
Tombstone simile, 122f. Cf. Fictitious monuments, Bogus inscriptions
Trikaranos/triphales, 2, 109
Tragic actor, 10, 13, 21, 61, 115. Cf. Actor image
Treasure discovered, 107, cf. 108
Trial scenes, 129, 150ff.
Turning to stone, 94, 111
Typical names, 49
Tyrant as type, 11, 99

Unlikely personifications, 25
Unlikely speaker, 14
Unlikely weapons of war, 60
Uninitiated guest, 87
Uninvited guest, 96f., 129
Unquenchable thirst, 35
Unusual attachments, 27, 33, 36
Unusual chains, 32
Unusual plagues, 61
Unwelcome encounter, 130
Utopia, 23, 25f., cf. 60, 121, 180. —promised to a pupil, 81.

Vanity of human wishes, 13, 107
Views from a vantage-point, 12, 16f., 57, 112. Cf. spying on immorality
Vulture, as parody of eagle, 52f., 112. Cf. 28ff.

Walking out in disgust, 56, 78, 89. Cf. Patient idealist withdraws
Wasp-simile, 23f.
Water-vessel simile, 121
Wealth, attacked, 144; benefits the unjust, 92; blind, 92. See also Rich and poor
Web of Fate, 21, 27
Well as mirror, 64
Wife and slave, 108, 126